

Corrected to February 8, 1781.

**COMPANION
TO THE
ROYAL KALENDAR,**

For the YEAR 1781 :

Being a LIST of all the

CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATION,

From the Accession of the present King

In **OCTOBER, 1760,**

To the present Time.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

List of the late and present House of Commons,

SHewing

The Changes made in the Members of Parliament,
by the General Election in **SEPTEMBER, 1780 ;**

the Names of the Candidates where the Elections
were contested, the Numbers polled, and the Decisions
made by the Select Committees.

the Dates when each City and Borough first sent Re-
presentatives to Parliament, the Right of Election in each
Place, and the supposed Number of Voters.

THE TWENTY NINTH EDITION.

An **APPENDIX**, containing the **CASES** of the con-
verted Elections in the Years 1774 and 1775 ; with the
Determinations of the several Committees upon the same.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ALMON and J. DEBRET, opposite
Burlington-House, Piccadilly. 1781.

[Price One Shilling.]

Philip James

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS Edition contains a List of the late and present House of Commons, shewing the Changes made in the Members of Parliament by the General Election of 1780. And it is further improved with the Addition of the Date when each City and Borough first sent Representatives to Parliament, the Right of Election in each Place, and the supposed Number of Electors. Where the Right of Election has been ascertained by a Resolution of the House of Commons, the Date of that Resolution is given. Where there is no Date to the Right of Election there has been no Resolution of the House upon it, and the Custom, which is given, is still adhered to. The supposed Number of Electors follow.

EXPLANATION.

Abingdon first sent Representatives to Parliament in the 4th Year of the Reign of Philip and Mary. The Right of Election is in the Inhabitants not receiving Alms, or any Charity, by a Resolution of the House of Commons the 18th of January, 1708. The supposed Number of Voters are 600.

Respecting the Lists of Changes in all the great Offices, the Rule laid down and pursued in this little Book, is, in each office first giving the Person or Persons who held that Department at the Accession of the present King, and then the Changes, or Alterations, which have been since made follow with their Dates.

No Pains have been spared to be as accurate as possible: But Notice of any Errors will, at all Times be thankfully received by the Publisher; together with any Hints for Improvement.

ALIST of the late and present Members of Parliament.

* * The names in Roman characters are the gentlemen elected at the General Election in 1774, and the names in *Italic* characters, are the gentlemen elected afterwards.

* * The names in Roman characters are the gentlemen elected at the General Election in 1780, and the names in *Italic* characters are the gentlemen who were candidates. The figures shew the numbers who voted for each person.

Abington, Berks. 4 Phil. and Mary.

JOHN Mayor, esq.

RE-elected 137
Thomas Wooldridge 55

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot, and not receiving
ms or any charity. 18 Jan. 1708.—600.

Agmondesham, Bucks. 28 Edw. I. 21 Ja. I.

William Drake, esq.

re-elected

William Drake, jun. esq.

re elected

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot only. 1 Dec. 1705.
130.

St. Albans, Herts. 35 Edw. I. 7 Edw. VI.

Richard Sutton, bart.

William Charles Sloper, esq.

John Radcliffe, esq.

re-elected

In the mayor, aldermen, and freemen, and such househol-
ers only as pay scot and lot. 27 April, 1714.—1000.

Aldborough, Suffolk. 3 Eliz.

Richard Combe, esq.

P. Champion Crespigny, esq.

Fonnereau, esq. died in

1779

John Fonnereau, esq.

re-elected

Resolved by the committee not to be in the bailiffs, bur-
ges, and freemen, receiving alms ; but in the bailiffs and
ges, resident within the borough, not receiving alms.
Dec. 1709. To which the house disagreed. In the inha-
nts paying scot and lot. *Custom.*—80.

*Aldborough, Yorkshire.*Abel Smith, Esq. vacated in
1778*Hon. Wm. Hanger*

C. Wilkinson, Esq. vacat. 1777

W. Baker, Esq.

Ult. Phil. and Mary.

Sir Rich. Sutton, bart. m.
his election for Sandwic*Hon. Edw. Onslow*

Charles Mellish, Esq.

Not in the select number of burgesses, holding by burgh
tenure; but all the inhabitants paying scot and lot have
right to vote. 17 May, 1690.—57.

Andover, Hants. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Jn. Griffin Griffin, K.B. re-elected

Benj. Lethieullier, Esq. re-elected

In the tailiff and select number of burgesses only. 28
1702. 1 April, 1689.

Anglesea.

Lord Viscount Bulkeley re-elected

Appleby, Westmoreland. 23 Edw. I.

Phil. Honeywood, Esq. re-elected

George Johnstone, Esq. William Lowther, Esq.
his election for Carlisle
Hon. W. Pitt

Burgage tenure.—120.

Arundel, Suffex. 23 Edw. I.

Thomas Brand, Esq. Sir P. Crawford, knight.

G. Lew. Newnham, Esq. Thomas Fitzherbert, Esq.

Hon. Percy Windham

Only in the inhabitants of the said borough, paying
and lot. 22 Feb. 1693.—100.

Ashburton, Devon. 26 Edw. I.

Charles Boone, Esq. re-elected

Robert Palk, Esq. re-elected

In the freeholders having lands or tenements holden
the said borough only; and the freeholders of lands and
tenements called Halfhanger and Hallwell-lands, lying
in the borough, and subject to pay borough-rent, have
to vote. 20 Feb. 1707.—200.

Aylesbury, Bucks. 1 Mary.

Anthony Bacon, Esq. re-elected

Jn. Aubrey, Esq. Thomas Ord, Esq.

J. Smith

In all the householders of the said borough, not receiv-
ing alms: persons receiving alms, pursuant to the will of
Bedford, disabled from voting. 28 Jan. 1695. 7 Feb.

Banbury, Oxfordshire 1 Mary.

re-elected; vacated in 1778,
and re-elected, as also in
1780

In the mayor, aldermen, and capital burgeses of Banbury
only. 29 Dec. 1691.—19.

Barnstable, Devon. 23 Edw. I.

John Cleveland, esq.

re-elected

W. Devaynes, esq.

Francis Bassett, esq.

William Devaynes, esq.

In the corporation and burgeses.—326.

Bath, Somersetshire. 23 Edw. I.

John Smith, esq. died in 1775 Hon J. Jefferies Pratt

John Sebright, bart.

Bel Moysey, esq.

19 re-elected

In the mayor, aldermen, and common council only. 27
Jan. 1706.—30.

Beaumaris, Anglesea.

Hugh Williams, bart.

Sir G. Warren, K. B.

In the mayor and capital burgeses of the said borough.
March, 1725.—24.

Bedfordshire.

John of Upper Ossory

re-elected

Thomas Hampden

Hon. St. Andrew St. John

Bedford Town. 23 Edw. I.

W. Wake, bart.

re-elected

421

Whitbread, esq.

re elected

673

J. Kenrick

304

the burgeses, freemen, and inhabitants, being householders
of Bedford, not receiving alms. 22 April, 1690.—1000.

Bedwin, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

John Methuin, esq.

re-elected

John of Courtown vacat. 1774

Sir Merrick Burrell, bart.

John Cranburn

In the freeholders and inhabitants of ancient burgage-
tenures. 26 March 1729.—80.

Beerston, Devon. 27 Eliz.

F. Hen. Drake, bart.

Lord Algernon Percy made
his elect. for Northumb.

Geo. Hobart.

Lord Visc. Fielding

Lord Macartney

In the freehold tenants of the said borough, holding by
burgage-tenure, and paying 3d. per annum, or more, ancient

burgage-rent, to the lord of the said borough, and in the only. 6 June, 1721.—70.

Berkshire.

Chris. Griffith, esq. died 1776

W. H. Hartley, esq. re-elected

John Elwes, esq. re-elected

Berwick, Northumberland. Hen. VIII.

Hon. John Vaughan re-elected.

J. Wilkinson, esq. Sir J. Huss. Delaval, bart.

Stated in the report to be in the freemen of Berwick. March, 1695.—500.

Beverley, Yorkshire. 23 Edw. I. 5 Eliz.

Sir J. Pennyman, bart. re-elected

G. F. Tufnel, Esq. Evelyn Anderson, Esq.

In the burgage-holders—1000.

Bewdley, Worcestershire. James I.

Lord Westcote re-elected

In the bailiff and twelve capital burgesses, who elect other burgesses to vote with them.—In the bailiff and burgesses appointed by the charter 3^o Jac. Primi, exclusive to all others 28 April, 1662.—Not in all the inhabitants of the said borough. 27 May, 1679.

Bishop's-Castle, Shropshire. 17 Eliz.

Henry Strachey, esq. vacated Henry Strachey, esq. in 1778

Alex. Wedderburne, esq. created a peer in 1780

Wm. Clive, esq. re-elected

Agreed to be in the bailiff and all the burgesses within the borough. 3 Feb. 1699.—100.

Bleckingley, Surry. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Robert Clayton, bart. re-elected

Frederick Standart, esq. John Kenrick, esq.

Resolved to be in the borough-holders, and that the bailiff had nothing to do with the election. 22 March, 1723.—9

Bodmyn, Cornwall. 23 Edw. I.

Geo. Hunt, esq. re-elected

Sir James Laroche, bart. William Masterman, esq.

Sir James Laroche

In the mayor, aldermen, and common council.—36.

Boroughbridge, Yorkshire. 1 Mary.

Anthony Eyre, esq. re-elected

William Philips, esq. Charles Ambler, esq.

In the burgage-holders.—65.

Bossiney, Cornwall. 7 Edw. VI.

Lord Mount Stuart, called to
the House of Peers in 1776

Hon. Charles Stuart re-elected

Hon. H. L. Luttrell re-elected

In the freemen in the borough.—20.

Boston, Lincolnshire. Edw. VI.

Lord Robert Bertie re-elected

Charles Amcotts, esq. died in

1777

Humphrey Sibthorpe, esq. re-elected

Sir Christopher Whicboc

In the commonalty, and not in the mayor, aldermen, and
common council. 8 May, 1628.—Only in the mayor, ai-
ldermen, common council, and freemen of the said borough,
resident within the said borough, and paying scot and lot. 20
March, 1711.—Only in the mayor, aldermen, common
council, and freemen of the said borough, resident in the said
borough, paying scot and lot, and claiming their freedom by
birth or servitude. 2 March, 1719.—200.

Brackley, Northamptonshire. 1 Edw. VI.

Wm. Egerton, esq. John. Wm. Egerton, esq.

Timothy Caswall, esq. re-elected

In the mayor, aldermen, and burgessees of the said borough.
20 April, 1714.—33.

Bramber, Sussex. 23 Edw. I.

Thomas Thornton, esq. re-elected

Sir Henry Gough, bart. re-elected

Agreed to be in the persons inhabiting ancient houses, or
in houses built on ancient foundations, paying scot and lot.
18 Jan. 10 Mar. 1703. 1 June, 1715.—20.

Brecon County.

Charles Morgan, esq. re-elected

Brecon Town.

Charles Van, esq. died 1778

Charles Gould, esq. re-elected

In the corporation and free burgessees.

Bridgenorth, Shropshire. 23 Edw. I.

Lord Pigot died in 1777;

and in 1778

Admiral Pigot was elected re-elected

Thomas Whitmore, esq. re-elected

In the corporation and freemen.—700.

Bridge-

Bridgewater, Somersetshire. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Anne Poulett

re-elected

Benj. Allen, esq.

re-elected.

John Acland, esq.

Stated to be in the majority of the corporation, consisting of a mayor, aldermen, and capital burgesſes, in number 24. 7 Dec. 1669.—Agreed to be in those that pay scot and lot inhabiting in the said borough. 10 Dec. 1692. 9 March 1769.—If the mayor, aldermen, and capital burgesſes, are not inhabitants, though they pay scot and lot, yet they have no right to vote. 9 Mar. 1769.—The inhabitants of the eastern and western divisions of the parish of Bridgewater have no right to vote for representatives, but the right of election is in the inhabitants of that division of the said parish which is commonly called the Borough, paying scot and lot within the said division, and in them only. 14 March, 1769.—300

Bridport, Dorset. 23 Edw. I.

Thomas Coventry, esq.

Thomas Scott, esq.

Hon. L. Ferd. Cary

Richard Beckford, esq.

In the commonalty in general. 12 April, 1628.

Agreed to be in all the inhabitants not receiving alms.

May, 1715.—400.

Bristol City. 47 Edw. III.

Hen. Cruger, esq.

Sir H. Lippincott, bart. 25

Edm. Burke, esq.

Matt. Brickdale, esq. 277

H. Cruger, esq. 127

S. Peach, esq. 78

Edmund Burke, esq. declined

Sir H. Lippincott died 178

In the freemen—5000.

Buckinghamshire.

Rt. Hon. R. Earl Verney

re-elected

Geo. Grenville, esq. succeeded

Earl Temple in 1779

Hon. Thomas Grenville

re-elected

Buckingham Town. 33 Hen. VIII.

James Grenville, jun. esq.

re-elected

Rich. Grenville, esq.

Rich. Ald. Neville, esq.

In the bailiff and twelve burgesſes only. 11 Nov. 1669

—13.

Callington, Cornwall. 27 Eliz.

William Skrine, esq. John Morshead, esq.

John Dyke Acland, esq. died
in 1778

George Stratton, esq. re-elected

In the inhabitants 3 years housekeepers. — 100.

Calne, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Rt. Hon. Isaac Barré re-elected

John Dunning, esq. re-elected

In the inhabitants of the said borough, having a right of common, and being sworn at Ogborn-court. 22 Dec. 1720.

—In the ancient burghesses of the said borough only, and the right of returning burghesses is in the guild-shewards. 25 Feb. 1723. — 34.

Cambridgeshire.

Sir Samp. Gideon, bart.

Rt. Hon. Lord R. Manners

Sir J. Hynde Cotton, bart.

1741

Philip Yorke, esq. 1452

Sir Samp. Gideon, bart. 1058

All members of colleges, halls, or corporations, having no freeholds, saving in right thereof; and parsons and vicars, having no other freeholds but glebe-lands, are excluded from voting. 28 May, 1724.

Cambridge Town. Edw. I.

Hon. C. Slo. Cadogan

called to the House of Peers

Benj. Keene, esq.

re-elected

96

Soame Jenyns, esq.

J. Warwood Adeane

83

Gbris. Potter

18

In the mayor, bailiffs, and freemen, not receiving alms. 24 Feb. 1709. — 200.

Cambridge University. 1 James I.

James Mansfield, esq. 277

Richard Croftes, esq.

Hon. J. Townshend, 237

The Marquis of Granby succeeded Duke of Rutland, 1779

Lord Hyde 206

James Mansfield, esq.

R. Croftes, esq. 150

Hon. W. Pitt 141

In the doctors and masters of arts. — 340.

Camel-

Camelford, Cornwall. **Edw. VI.**

John Amyand, esq. James Macpherfon, esq.

Francis Herne, esq. died 1776

Sir Ralph Payne John Pardoe, jun. esq.

Stated to be in the freemen and inhabitants paying fees and lot. 3 Aug. 1660.—19.

Canterbury City. 23 **Edw. I.**

Lord Newhaven George Gipps, esq. 63

Richard Milles, esq. Charles Robinson, esq. 61

Lord Newhaven 46

Sir W. H. Daffwood 15

M. Lade 2

In the citizens and freemen.—1000.

Cardiff.

Sir H. Mackworth, bart. re-elected

In the burgesses of Cardiff, Aberavon, Cowbridge, Kenfigg Llantrissant, Lougher, Neth, and Swansey. 1000.

Cardiganshire.

Lord Lisburne re-elected

Cardigan.

Sir Rob. Smyth, decided on petition in favour of

Tbo. Jobnes, esq. John Campbell, esq.

In the burgesses at large of the boroughs of Cardigan, Aberystwith, Lampeter, and Atpar only. It was resolved the burgesses of Tregaron have not a right to vote. 7 May, 1730.—1200.

Carlisle. 3 **Charles I.**

Flet. Norton, esq. vacated in

1775

Walter Stanhope, esq.

Earl of Surrey

Ant. Storer, esq.

William Lowther, esq.

Agreed to be in the mayor, aldermen, bailiffs, and freemen, resident or not resident. Also, that the sons of burgesses, born after their fathers freedom, and persons serving seven years within the city, had a right to be made free. 23 Feb. 1711.—500.

Carmarthenshire.

John Vaughan, esq.

re-elected

Car-

Carmarthen.

John Adams, esq. George Phillips, esq.
In the burgeslies of the said borough. 19 March, 1727.

Carnarvonshire.

Ash. Smith, esq. John Parry, esq.

Carnarvon.

Glynn Wynn, esq. re-elected
In the burgeslies of arvon, Criccieth, Pulelly, Nevian
and Conway.

Castle Rising, Norfolk. Ult. Phil. & Mary.

Wedderburne, esq. made
his election for Oakhamp-
ton

on. Charles Finch
ob. Mackreth, esq. re-elected

Finch, vacated in 1777
to stand for Maidstone

Cherwynd Talbot, esq. re-elected
In the free burgeslies. — 50.

Cheshire.

John Crewe, esq. re-elected

Samuel Egerton, died in 1780

R. Salisbury Cotton, bart. re-elected

Chester City. 34 Hen. VIII.

John Tho. Grosvenor re-elected

Wilbraham Bootle re-elected

Stated to lie in the freemen. 2 Dec. 1690. — 1000.

Chichester, Sussex. 23 Edw. I.

William Keppel re-elected

Hon. Tho. Conolly Thomas Steele, esq.

the inhabitants paying scot and lot. 500.

Chippenham, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Ed. Bayntun, bart. Henry Dawkins, esq.

Marth, esq. Giles Hudson, esq.

the burgeslies and freemen, more than twelve. And it
resolved, that the new charter altered not the custom-

1724. 9 ibid. — 150.

Christ.

Christchurch, Hants. 13 Eliz.

Hen. Th. Villiers Hyde
James Harris, esq.

Sir James Harris, K. B.
re-elected, died in 1788
John Frederick, esq.

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot. — 70.

Cirencester, Gloucestershire. 13 Eliz.

James Whitshed, esq.

re-elected

S. Blackwell, esq.

re-elected

In all the inhabitants, householders. — 700. — N. B.
was resolved, in this case, that, where there is no custom
charter for the election, there the inhabitants (householder
ought to elect. 21 May, 1724. — The inmates were e
cluded. 4 Nov. 1690. — As also were the inhabitants
the Abbey, the Emery, and the Spiringate-lane. 8 Dec
1709.

Clitheroe, Lancashire. 1 Eliz.

Hen. Asheton Curzon

John Parker, esq.

Tho. Lister, esq.

re-elected

Hen. Ash Curzon

In such freeholders only as have estates for life, or in fee
4 Feb. 1661. — 90.

Cockermouth, Cumberland. 23 Edw. I.

Geo. Johnstone, esq. made

his election for Appleby

Flet. Norton, esq. made his

election for Carlisle

James Adair, esq.

W. Lowther, esq.

Ralph Gowland, esq.

J. Baynes Garforth, esq.

Burgage tenure. — 200.

Colchester, Essex. 23 Edw. I.

Charles Gray, esq.

Sir Rob. Smyth, bar

Is. Martin Rebow, esq.

re-elected

Alex. Fordyce

Robert Mayne

Agreed to be in the mayor, aldermen, common council
and free burgesses, not receiving alms. 6 May, 1714. — 14

N. B. The right of making foreigners (not having a right
of freedom) freemen, is in the mayor and free burgesses
common council assembled.

Corff-Castle, Dorsetshire. 14 Eliz.

John Bond, esq.

re-elected

John Jenkinson, esq.

Henry Bankes, esq.

(As in the report) appeared to be in lesses for years, paying scot and lot; and also in such persons as had the freehold in reversion, upon such lease for years. 6 April, 1699.— Agreed to be in such as have an estate of inheritance, or a lease for years, determinable upon life or lives, paying scot and lot. 2 March, 1699. Agreed to be in such persons as are seized in fee, in possession or reversion, of any messuage, tenement, or corporeal hereditament, within this borough; and in such persons as are tenants for life or lives; and, for want of such freehold, in tenants for years, determinable on any life or lives, paying scot and lot, and in no others. 21 Jan. 1718.—140.

Cornwall.

Sir W. Lemon, bart. re-elected

Sir J. Moleworth, bart. died

in 1775

Edward Eliot, esq.

re-elected

Coventry, Warwickshire. 23 Edw. I.

Edw. Roe Yeo, esq. 1571 Void election in Sept. 1780

Walter Waring, esq. 1111 Election in Dec. 1780

Tho. Green, esq. 827 Edward Roe Yeo, esq. 1298

Mr. Waring died in 1780, Lord Sheffield 1295

and J. B. Holroyd was Sir Tho. Halifax, kt. 1178

elected Tho. Rogers, esq. 1177

In such persons who have served seven years apprenticeship within the said city to one and the same trade, not receiving alms. 1 May, 1708.—But persons receiving the sacrament or bread money, Sir Thomas White's, or Sir Thomas Wheatley's gifts, were not then disqualified.—Members of the fullers company, being freemen, not receiving

alms or weekly charity, and freemen, who have served seven years apprenticeship in the city or suburbs, not receiving

alms or weekly charity, have a right to vote. 13 March, 1711.

—In such freemen as have served seven years apprenticeship to one and the same trade, in the city or suburbs, and do not receive alms or weekly charity, such freemen being duly sworn and enrolled. 20 Nov. 1722.—1400.

Cricklade, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Arn. Nesbit, esq. died 1779

Wm. Earle, esq. died 1774

John Dewar, esq.

John Macpherson, esq.

Paul Benfield, esq.
re-elected.

Samuel Petre, esq.

Agreed to be in the freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders for three years.—10 June, 1685.—Agreed to be freeholders and copyholders of the borough houses, and leaseholders for any term not under three years, only. 1 Aug. 1684.—The committee reported, that it was agreed to in the freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders for not less than three years. 20 Feb. 1695.—150.

Cumberland.

Sir J. Lowther, bart.

re-elected

Henry Fletcher, esq.

re-elected

Dartmouth, Devon. 26 Edw. I.

Lord Visc. Howe

re-elected

Richard Hopkins, esq.

Arthur Holdsworth, esq.

In the freemen of the borough. 28 Nov. 1689.—98

Denbighshire.

Sir W. W. Wynne, bart.

re-elected

Denbigh Town.

Rich. Myddleton, esq.

re-elected

In the burgesses of Denbigh Leon, alias Holt and Ruthy
—500.

Derbyshire.

Lord Geo. Cavendish

Lord Rich. Cavendish

Geo. Clarke, esq. died 1774

Hon. Nath. Curzon

re-elected

Derby Town. 23 Edw. I.

Lord Fred. Cavendish

Lord G. A. H. Cavendish

Wenman Coke, esq. made his
election for Norfolk

Dan. Parker Coke, esq.

Edward Coke, esq.

Dan. Parker Coke, esq.

In the corporation, freemen, and sworn-burgesses.—700

Devizes, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Charles Garth, esq.

re-elected, died in 1780

James Sutton, esq.

Henry Jones, esq.

Sir J. T. Long, bart.

In the mayor and select number of burgesses only.
March, 1688.

Devonshire.

Mr R. W. Bampfylde, bart.

died in 1776

Mr R. Walter, esq. died 1779

John Rolle, esq.

John Parker, esq.

re-elected

re-elected.

Dorsetshire.

George Pitt, esq.

re-elected

Humphry Sturt, esq.

re-elected

Dorchester, Dorset. 23 Edw. I.

John Damer, esq.

Hon. George Damer

Wm. Ewer, esq.

re-elected

In the inhabitants paying to church and poor, in respect of their personal estates; and in such persons as pay to church and poor, in respect of their real estates within the said borough. 17 and 18 May, 1720.—400.

N. B. Part of the parish of Holy Trinity, (formerly Froome-Whitfield parish) and the tithing of Collitonrow, were voted to be no parts of the said borough.

Dover, Kent. 42 Edw. III.

John Henniker, esq.

re-elected

John Trevanian, esq.

re-elected

In the freemen and free burgesses, inhabitants of Dover. 4 March, 1623.—The non-inhabitant freemen, as well as the inhabitant freemen, and free burgesses, have voice in the election of barons to serve in parliament. 12 March, 1770.—700.

Downton, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Thos. Duncombe, esq. died

in 1779

Mr Dummer, esq. died 1779

Mr Philip Hales

Mr B. Bouverie, died 1779

Robert Shaftoe, esq.

Hon. Hen. Sem. Conway 23

re-elected

Alexander Hume

J. Saunders

24

8

7

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot.—60.

B 2

Droit-

Droitwich, Worcestershire. 23 Edw. I.

Tho. Foley, esq. succeeded his
father as Lord Foley, Dec.

1777

re-elected

Edward Winnington, esq.

re-elected

In the burgeses of the corporation of Salt-springs, of
Droitwich. 11 Nov. 1690.—40.

Dunwich, Suffolk. 23 Edw. I.

Sir G. W. Van Neck, bart.

re-elected

Miles Barne, esq. vacated in

Dec. 1777,

Barne Barne, esq.

re-elected

Is not in the freemen of the said borough, commonly called
led outfitters, as well as in the freemen inhabiting within
the said borough; but only in the freemen inhabiting within
the said borough. 8 Dec. 1691.—Is in the freemen of
the said borough, commonly called outfitters, as well as in
the freemen inhabiting in the said borough. 25 Nov. 1699
---Was resolved to be only in the freemen inhabiting within
in the said borough, not receiving alms. 5 Feb. 1708.---40

Durham County.

Sir John Eden, bart.

re-elected

Sir T. Clavering, bart.

re-elected

Durham City. 30 Char. II.

John Lampton, esq.

re-elected

John Tempest, esq.

re-elected

In the corporation and freemen.—1200.

Eastlose, Cornwall. 13. Eliz.

John Buller, esq.

re-elected

Sir Cha. Whitworth vacated in 1774

Tbo. Graves, esq. vacated in

1775

Will. Graves, esq.

re-elected

In the mayor, burgeses, aldermen, and freemen.—49.

St. Edmondsbury, Suffolk.

Mr Cha. Davers, bart. re-elected

Mr Hon. A. J. Hervey, called to the House of Peers

1775

Mr. Conway

re-elected

Lord Hervey

In 1 alderman, 12 burgeses, and 24 common council.

Essex County.

John Conyers, esq. died 1775

John Luther, esq.

re-elected

Will. Harvey, esq. died 1779

T. B. Brampton, esq.

re-elected

Evesham, Worcestershire. 23 Edw. VI.

Mr John Rushout, bart.

re-elected

435

J. Seymour, esq.

W. Boughton Rouse

379

Charles Rudge

357

In the common burgeses. 22 Sept. 1669.—600.

Exeter, Devon. 23 Edw. VI.

R. Walter, esq. vacated in

1776

John Baring, esq.

re-elected

Mr C. W. Bampfelde, bart.

re-elected

In the freeholders and freemen.—1500.

Eye, Suffolk. 13 Eliz.

L. Phillipson, esq.

re-elected

Hon. Jn. St. John

Arn. James Skelton, esq.

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot.—200.

Flintshire.

Mr Roger Mostyn, bart.

re-elected

Flint Town.

Mr John Glynne, bart. died

in 1777

Watkin Williams, esq.

re-elected

In the inhabitants of the boroughs of Flint, Rhydlan,

Overton, Caerwys, and Caergurley, paying scot and lot; and

was resolved that the inhabitants of Knolton, and Over-

ton Foreign, have a right to vote in the election of a bur-

ges for parliament for the said town of Flint. 21 May, 1728.

—The inhabitants of the several boroughs of Flint,

Rhydlan, Caerwys, Caergurley, and Overton (including Knol-

ton and Overton Foreign) renting lands or tenements for

which the landlords thereof only pay scot and lot, have a

right to vote in the election of a burges for the borough
 Flint. 5 April, 1737.—The same have not a right.
 March, 1741.—1.

Fowey, Cornwall. 13 Eliz.

Philip Rashleigh, esq. re-elected

Lord Shulldham re-elected

In the prince's tenants, who are capable of being portreeve
 and such of the inhabitants only as pay scot and lot.

May, 1701.—Prince's tenants, capable of being portreeve
 of Fowey, are such tenants only as have been duly admit-
 ted upon the court-rolls of the manor, and have done the
 fealty. 5 March, 1770.—63.

Gatton, Surrey. 29 Hen. V.

Sir Wm. Mayne, made his
 election for Canterbury

Robert Scott, esq. made his
 election for Wootton-Basset

Robert Mayne, esq. re-elected

William Adam, esq. Lord Newhaven

In the inhabitants, the return made by them being adju-
 ged good, was (by the then petitioner) insisted to be in the
 inhabitants not receiving alms, and in the freeholders having
 such freehold in their own occupation. 26 March, 1621
 —Was (by the then sitting member) insisted to be in the
 freeholders, and inhabitants paying scot and lot; and he was
 adjudged duly elected. 15 Dec. 1696.

St. Germain's, Cornwall. 5 Eliz.

Ben. Langlois, esq.

Edward Eliot, esq. vacated
 in 1775

John Pownall, esq. vacated in Edward James Eliot, esq.
 1776

John Peachy, esq. Dudley Long, esq.

In the freemen.—50.

Glamorganshire.

Hon. G. V. Vernon

Charles Edwin, esq.

Gloucester

Gloucestershire.

Sir Wm. Guise, bart. re-elected

Edward Southwell, esq. called to the House of Peers in 1776

W. B. Chester, esq. re-elected, died in 1780
James Dutton, esq.

Gloucester. 23 Edw. I.

Charles Barrow, esq. re-elected

G. Aug. Selwyn, esq. John Webb, esq.

In the freemen.—2000.

Grampound. 7 Edw. VI.

Sir Jos. York, K. B. Sir John Ramsden, bart.

R. A. Neville, esq. Thomas Lucas, esq.

In the mayor, recorder, and inhabitants, paying scot and lot.—59.

Grantbam, Lincolnshire. Edw. IV.

Lord George Sutton George Sutton, esq.

Sir Bro. Cust, created Lord

Brownlow, 1776

Peregrine Cust, esq. Francis Cockayne Cust, esq.

In the freemen of the said borough, not receiving alms or charity. 11 Jan. 1710—400.

Great Grimsby, Lincolnshire.

Joseph Mellish, esq. John Harrison, esq.

Evelyn Anderson, esq. Francis Eyre, esq.

East Grinstead, Suffex. 1 Edw. II.

Lord G. S. Germain re-elected

Sir John Irwin, K. B. re-elected

Is in the inhabitants as well as burgage-holders, and the borough is an ancient borough by prescription. 7 April, 1679.—Is in the burgage-holders only, and not in the burgage-holders and inhabitants. 9 Feb. 1695.—36.

Guildford, Surrey. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Fletcher Norton re-elected

George Onslow re-elected

Is only in the freemen and freeholders, paying scot and lot, resident in the town. 24 April, 1689.—It was agreed, that one who had served seven years to a freeman, was ipso facto a freeman. 3 Feb. 1710.

Hamp-

Hampshire.

Sir H. P. St. John, knt. Rob. Thistlethwaite, esq.
 Sir Simon Stuart, bart. died
 in 1779

Ferwoise Clarke Ferwoise, esq. re-elected

Harwich, Essex. 17 Edw. III. 12 Ja. I.

John Robinson, esq. re-elected

Edw. Harvey, esq. died 1778

Hon. G. A. North re-elected

In the mayor, aldermen, and capital burgeses, or head-boroughs, resident within the said borough. 6 April, 1714.
 —31.

Haslemere, Surrey. 27 Eliz.

T. M. Molyneux, esq. died
 1776

Peter Burrell, esq.

Sir James Lowther, bart.

Sir Merrick Burrell, bart.

Edward Norton, esq.

In the freeholders resident within the borough.
 20 May, 1661, 9 Feb. 1698.—60.—By the word *freeholders* is meant only freeholders of messuages, lands, or tenements, lying within the borough and manor of Haslemere, whether the same pay rent to the lord of the said borough and manor or not, exclusive of any lands or tenements which are, or have been, parcel of the waste ground of the said borough and manor, or any messuages or buildings which are, or shall be, standing thereon. 25 April, 1755. Petition of Mr. Oglethorpe rejected, for not being signed by himself. 3 and 4 March, 1713.—The like relating to Wigan.

Hastings, Suffex. 42 Edw. III.

Lord Palmerston re-elected

Rt. Hon. C. Jenkinson

John Ord, esq.

Is in the mayor, jurats, and freemen resident, and not receiving alms. 30 Jan. 1698.—200.

Haverfordwest, Pembrokehire.

Lord Kensington

re-elected

Agreed to be in the freeholders, burgeses, and inhabitants paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms. 4 July, 1715
 —500.

Helford

Helston, Cornwall. 23 Edw. I.

Lord Caermarthen a Peer	Philip Yorke, esq.
Mr. Owen, died	Joc. Dean, esq. dead
Mr. Cockayne <i>Cust</i> , esq.	Lord Hyde
Philip Yorke, esq.	Wm. Evelyn, esq.

A double return.

In the mayor and inhabitants at large. 10 Dec. 1660.—
To which the house disagreed.

Herefordshire.

Thomas Foley, esq. created a
Peer 1776

Sir George Cornewall, bart.	re-elected
Mr. Hon. Thomas Harley	re-elected

Hereford City. 23 Edw. I.

John Scudamore, esq.	re-elected
Sir Rich. Symonds, bart.	re-elected

In the citizens and freemen.—1200.

Hertfordshire.

Wm. Plumer, esq.	re-elected
Tho. Halsey, esq.	re-elected

On hearing the merits of a former election, it was resolved,
that evidence ought not to be admitted to disqualify an elector
as no freeholder, who at the election swore himself to be a
freeholder. 16 Jan. 1695 —Resolution to the contrary,
concerning Bedford county. 28 June, 1715.

Hertford Town. 35 Edw. I. 21 Ja. I.

John Calvert, esq.	Thomas Dimsdale	286
Paul Fielde, esq.	William Baker, esq.	256
	J. Calvert	241

Is not in such persons only, as are inhabitants (household-
ers) of the said borough, not receiving alms, and in such
freemen, who, at the time of their freedom granted to them,
were inhabitants of the said borough, or of the parishes there-
of; but in all the freemen and inhabitants being householders,
not receiving alms. 27 Jan. 1701.—Is in the inhabitants
not receiving alms, and in such freemen only as at the time
of their being made free were inhabitants of the said bo-
rough, or the parishes thereof. The number of freemen
living out of the borough not exceeding three persons. 5 Dec.
1705.—700.

Heyden,

Heyden, Yorkshire. 23 Edw. I. 1 Edw. VI.

Beilby Thomson, esq. Christopher Atkinson 11

Rt. Hon. Sir C. Saunders, di- William Chayter 9

ed in 1775

Hon. L. T. Watson B. Thompson 2

Is in the burgesses. 3 April, 1746.—150.

Heytesbury, Wilts. 27 Hen. VI.

Wm. A. Ashe, esq. re-elected

Hon. Wm. Gordon William Eden, esq. made hi

election for Woodstock

Francis Burton, esq.

Is in the burgage-holders.—50.

Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire. 2, 3, Ph. & M.

Fred. Montagu, esq. re-elected

In the mayor, aldermen, burgesses, and freemen, being householders, and not receiving alms. 28 Jan. 1702.—100.

Hindon, Wilts. 27 Hen. VI.

Henry Dawkins esq. Lloyd Kenyon, esq. 18

Arch. Macdonald, esq. Nat. Wm. Wraxall, esq. 17

J. Saunders 2

S. Peach 1

Is in the inhabitants of houses within the said borough being housekeepers and parishioners, not receiving alms 12 April, 1728.

Honiton, Devon. 28 Edw. I. 4 Edw. II. 16 Ch. I.

Sir Geo. Yonge, bart. re-elected 39

Lawrence Cox, esq. Alex. Macleod, esq. 25

Lawrence Cox 22

Is in the inhabitants of the said borough, paying scot and lot. 3 Feb. 1710.—Is in the inhabitants, housekeepers commonly called potwallers, not receiving alms. 18 Dec 1724.—450.

Horsbham, Sussex. 23 Edw. I.

James Wallace, esq. re-elected

Rt. Hon. Jere. Dyson, died

in 1776

Earl of Drogheda Viscount Lewisham, made h

election for Staffordshire

Sir Geo. Osborne

Is in all such persons as have an estate of inheritance, for life, in burgage houses, or burgage lands, lying within the said borough. 16 June, 1715.—60.

Hunting

Huntingdonshire.

L. Vise. Hinchinbroke re-elected
 Earl of Ludlow re-elected
Huntingdon. 23 Edw. I.
 Sir Geo. Wombwell, bart. re-elected, died in 1780
 Hon. Mr. W. A. Montagu Sir Hugh Palliser
 died in 1775
 Lord Mulgrave re-elected
 In the freemen and inhabitants.—200.

Hythe, Kent. 42 Edw. III.

Sir Cha. Farnaby, bart. re-elected 62
 Wm. Evelyn, esq. re-elected 61
John Stevenson, esq. 44
Rich. James, esq. 42

Is in the mayor, jurats, common-council, and freemen.
 7 Jan. 1710.—50.

Iwelcheſter, Somerſetſhire. 23 Edw. I.

Nathaniel Webb, esq. Peregrine Cuſt, esq.
 O. Saluſb. Brereton, esq. Sam. Smith, jun. esq.

Alledged to be in the inhabitants of the ſaid town, paying ſcot and lot, which the town called potwallers. 7 May, 1689.—Agreed to be in the bailiff, capital burgeſſes, and inhabitants not receiving alms. 28 Jan. 1702.—100.

Ipswich, Suffolk. 23 Edw. I.

Wm. Wollaſton, esq. Wm. Wollaſton, esq. 347
 Tho. Staunton, esq. Tho. Staunton, esq. 341
Jof. Grigby 253
W. Middleton 247

Is in the bailiff, portmen, commonalty, and freemen, not receiving alms. 3 Feb. 1710.—600.—A reſolution paſſed, that portmen are an eſſential conſtituent part of the great court for making freemen of the ſaid borough, without ſome of which portmen being preſent, the ſaid court cannot be held. 31 March, 1714.

St. Ives, Cornwall. 5 Mary I.

Adam Drummond, esq. died

in 1779

Philip Dehan, esq.

Abel Smith

Lord Newborough

William Praed, esq.

Is in the inhabitants, paying ſcot and lot. 8 Dec. 1702.
 —183.

Kent.

Kent.

Hon. Cha. Marsham re-elected
 Tho. Knight, jun. esq. Filmer Honeywood, esq.
King's Lynn, Norfolk. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Tho. Walpole re-elected
 Crisp. Molyneux, esq. re-elected

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot. — 600.

Kingston-upon-Hull, Yorkshire. 23. Edw. III.

Rt. Hon. Lord R. Manners re-elected
 D. Hartley, esq. Wm. Wilberforce, esq. 11

David Hartley, esq. 4

In the burgesses and freemen. — 1090.

Knareborough. Yorkshire.

Sir Ant. Tho. Abdy, bart.

died in 1775

Lord G. H. Cavendish Visc. Duncannon

Hon. Rob. Boyle Walsingham re-elected

Agreed to be in the burghage-holders. 17 May, 1691. — 50.

Lancashire.

Lord Stanley; became Earl
 of Derby in 1776

T. Stanley re-elected

Sir Tho. Egerton, bart. re-elected

Lancaster. 23 Edw. I. Edw. VI.

Sir Geo. Warren, K. B. Wilson Braddyll, esq.

Lord Rich. Cavendish Abraham Rawlinson, esq.

In the freemen and inhabitants. — 1000.

Launceston, Cornwall. 23 Edw. I.

Rt. Hon. Hum. Morice Lord Cranburn, succeeded
 father as Earl of Salisbury

John Buller, esq. in 1780

Hon. C. G. Perceval

Tho. Bowlby, esq.

In the mayor, aldermen, and freemen, being inhabitants
 at the time they were made free, and not receiving pay
 the parish. 17 March, 1723. — The aldermen to be electe
 ed out of the legal freemen. 24 March, 1734.

Leicestershire.

Hon. T. Noel, a Peer, 1774

J. P. Hungerford, esq. re-elected

Sir John Palmer, bart. Wm. Pochin, esq.

[25]
Leicester Town.

Hon. Booth Grey re-elected
John Darker, esq. re-elected

Agreed to be in the freemen, not receiving alms, and in the inhabitants paying scot and lot. But persons living in the borough by certificate, not having gained a settlement, by renting 10l. per annum, or serving in an annual office, are not entitled (by paying scot and lot) to vote. 8 Feb. 1705.—1100.

Leominster, Herefordshire. 23 Edw. I.

Lord Visc. Bateman re-elected 357

T. Hill, esq. died 1776

F. Cornwall, jun. esq. R. P. Knight, esq. 345
Thomas Mitton 44

Granted to be in the bailiffs, capital burgesses, and inhabitants paying scot and lot. 16 April, 1725.—400.

Leskard, Cornwall. 23 Edw. I.

Edward Gibbon, esq. Hon. A. Tollemache
Samuel Salt, esq. re-elected

In the corporation, and sworn free-burgesses.—1000.

Lestwithiel, Cornwall. 33 Edw. I. 4 Edw. II.

Charles Brett, esq. vacat. 1776

Thomas Potter, esq.

Lord Fairford

Tho. De Grey, jun. esq.

Hon. John St. John, made his election for Newport
George Johnstone, esq.

Is in the mayor, and six capital burgesses, together with the seventeen assistants annually chosen, and who had a right to vote at the preceding election of a mayor. 20 Dec. 1709.

Lewes, Sussex. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Thomas Miller, bart.

Thomas Hay, esq.

Hon. Henry Pelham, esq. 95

Thomas Kempe, esq. 91

Thomas Hay, esq. 76

In the inhabitants, being householders, paying scot and lot.

8 May, 1735.—400.

Lime Regis, Dorset. 23 Edw. I.

Henry Fane, esq. died 1777

Hon. Henry Fane

Francis Fane, esq.

Henry Harford, esq.

Lionel Darell, jun. esq.

Hon. Henry Fane

D. R. Michel, esq.

A double return.

Insisted to be in the mayor, burgesses and freeholders. 21 May, 1689.—Alledged to be in the mayor, capital burgesses and freemen. 28 Feb. 1727.—50.

Lord Brownlow Bertie, succeeded Duke of Ancaster

Ch. And. Pelham, esq.

Sir John Thorold, bart.

Lincoln City.

Lord Visc. Lumley

R. Vyner, jun. esq.

re-elected

re-elected

49 Hen. III.

Sir Tho. Clarges, bart.

re-elected

Lord Lumley

T. Scroope, esq.

In the citizens and freemen.—1100.

Litchfield, Staffordshire. 33 Edw. I.

Geo. Anson, esq.

re-elected

Thomas Gilbert, esq.

re-elected

Is in the bailiff, magistrates, freeholders of 40s. a year, and all that hold by burgage-tenure; and such freemen as are inrolled and pay scot and lot; and also such freemen only the taylor's company as are inrolled in the new book of constitutions (and not the old book) have a right to vote.

May, 1701.—Resolved to be in the bailiffs, magistrates freeholders of 40s. per annum, and all that hold by burgage tenure; and in such freemen only as are inrolled, pay scot and lot there. 10 Dec. 1718.—600.

Liverpool, Lancashire. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Wm. Meredith, bart.

Henry Rawlinson, esq.

Rd. Pennant, esq.

Bamb. Gascoyne, jun. esq.

Richard Pennant, esq.

Admitted to be in the mayor, bailiffs, and freemen not receiving alms. 5 March, 1729.—1200.

London. 49 Hen. III.

John Sawbridge, esq.

J. Kirkman, esq. died before the return

Frederick Bull, esq.

re-elected

Richard Oliver, esq.

Nath. Newnham, esq.

George Hayley, esq.

re-elected

George Hayley

J. Kirkman, died before the return

Fred. Bull

Nath. Newnham

J. Sawbridge

Rich. Clarke

J. Sawbridge, esq. elected

Nov. 1780, vice J. Kirkman

In the livery. Act of 1725.—7000.

Ludlow, Shropshire. 12 Edw. IV.

Lord Clive re-elected
Lord Viscount Villiers Fred. Cornwall, esq.

Is in the resiant common burgesses, as well as the twelve and twenty-five. 26 Feb. 1661.—500.—It was resolved, that the sons of burgesses of Ludlow, and those that marry the daughters of burgesses, have a right to be made burgesses; and that every person, having a right to be made burgess, ought to demand the same by petition, signed by the petitioner, according to the bye-law in 1663, and not otherwise.—1 March, 1698.

Luggershall, Wiltshire. 23 Edw. I.

Lord Melburne re-elected
Lord George Gordon Geo. Aug. Selwyn, esq.

Is in the freeholders or leaseholders of the said borough, terminable upon life or lives. 17 Jan. 1705.—70.

Lymington, Hants. 27 Eliz.

Henry Goodrick, esq. Harry Burrard, esq.
Edward Morant, esq. Thomas Dummer, esq.

Resolved to be a corporation by prescription, and that the mayor and burgesses only have a right to elect members for parliament. 29 Dec. 1691.—Is not in the mayor, burgesses, and commonalty, paying scot and lot, but only in the mayor and burgesses, exclusive of the commonalty, paying scot and lot. 18 Feb. 1695.—Is not in the mayor, burgesses, and inhabitants, not receiving alms; but in the mayor and burgesses only. 11 Jan. 1710.—80.

Maidstone, Kent. Edw. VI. 2 Eliz.

Hor. Mann re-elected 558
Lord Guernsey became Earl Clement Taylor 399
of Aylesford in 1777
Hon. Cha. Finch 362

Agreed to be in the freemen not receiving alms or charity. 8 Dec. 1702.—700.

Malden, Essex. 2 Edw. III.

Rd. Sav. Nassau, dead Eliab Harvey, esq.
John Strutt, esq. re-elected

Is in such freemen as do not receive alms, and are entitled to freedom by birth, marriage or servitude; and that persons living their right of freedom from honorary freemen, and persons claiming their freedom by purchase, and exercising the same within the borough, have no right to vote. 20 May, 1715.

Malmesbury, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

William Strahan, esq.

Hon. Charles James Fox

Visc. Lewisham, made his
election for Staffordshire

John Calvert, jun. esq.

Visc. Fairford

Agreed to be in the aldermen and twelve capital burgesse
13 Dec. 1702.*Malton, Yorkshire.* 23 Edw. I. 16 Car.Edmund Burke, esq. made his
election for Bristol

Wm. Weddel, esq.

Savile Finch, esq.

re-elected

re-elected, vacated in 1780

Edmund Burke, esq.

In the burgage holders. — 100.

Marlborough, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. James Brudenell

Sir J. Tylney Long, bart.

Earl of Courtown

William Woodley, esq.

Is in the mayor and burgesse only. 13 May, 1771. — 21.

Marlow, Bucks. 28 Edw. I. 21 Ja. I.

Wm. Clayton, esq.

Sir J. B. Warren

re-elected

re-elected

Paul Benfield, esq.

Is in the inhabitants only, who pay scot and lot. 21 N
1690. — 216.*St. Marw's, Cornwall.* 5 Eliz.

Lord Nugent

Hugh Boscawen, esq.

re-elected

re-elected

In the mayor and resident burgesse. — 31.

St. Michael's, Cornwall. 7 Edw. VI.James Scawen, esq. made his
election for Surry

T. Howard, esq. succeeded

Earl of Suffolk in 1779

Francis Hale, esq.

John Stephenson, esq.

re-elected

Hon. Wm. Hanger.

In the portreeve, and lords of the manor who are cap
of being portreeves, and the inhabitants of the said baro
paying scot and lot. 20 March, 1700. — 26.*Merionethshire.*John Pugh Price, esq. died
in 1774

Ev. Lloyd Vaughan, esq.

re-elected

H. Ar. Corbett, esq.

Mid

Midhurst, Suffex. 4 Edw. III.

Sir H. Mackworth, bart. made
his election for Cardiff
Cle. Tudway, esq. made his
election for Wells

Hon. H. S. Conway
John Ord, esq.

Hon. John St. John, made
his election for Newport
Sir Sampson Gideon
Henry Drummond, esq.

In the burgage holders. — 100.

Middlesex.

John Glyn, esq. died in 1779

Thomas Wood, esq.

John Wilkes, esq.

George Byng, esq.
re-elected

Milbourn Port, Somersetshire. 26 Edw. I.

Hon. T. Luttrell

C. Wolseley, esq.

J. H. Medlycott, esq. 62

John Townson, esq. 56

Hon. T. Luttrell 44

J. Hunter 36

Is only in the capital bailiffs and their deputies, in the
commonalty, stewards, and the inhabitants paying scot and
lot. 8 Dec. 1702.

Minehead, Somersetshire. 1 Eliz.

H. Fow. Luttrell, esq. va-
cated in 1774

The Pownall, esq.

Jn. Fow. Luttrell, esq.

Fran. Fow. Luttrell, esq.
re-elected

Is in the parishioners of Minehead and Dunster, being house-
keepers in the borough of Minehead, and not receiving alms.

24 Feb. 1717. — 160. — The precept to be directed to the two
constables, and they to make the return. 13 June, 1717.

Monmouthshire.

John Morgan, esq.

re-elected

John Hanbury, esq.

re-elected

Monmouth Town. Hen. VIII.

John Stepney, bart.

re-elected

Doth not belong to the burgesses and inhabitants of Mon-
mouth only, but the inhabitants of the borough of Newport
and Aske have a right to vote. 26 Nov. 1680. — 800.

Montgomeryshire.

Edw. Kynaston, esq. died 1772

W. Most. Owen, esq. 700

Watkin Williams, esq.

Watk. Williams, esq. 624

Montgomery Town.

Whitshed Keene, esq. re-elected

Is in the burgeses of the said town only. 80.

Morpeth, Northumberland. 1 Mary.

Peter Delme, esq. re-elected

Hon. Wm. Byron, died 1776

G. Elliot, esq. vacated 1777

J. W. Egerton, esq. Anthony Storer, esq.

Is only in the bailiffs and free burgeses of the said borough. 9 March, 1695.—200.

Newark, Nottingham. 24 Car. II.

Sir Henry Clinton re-elected

George Sutton, esq. Lord George Sutton

Robert Forster, esq.

Is in the mayor, aldermen, and inhabitants within the borough, who pay, or ought to pay, scot and lot. 11 Jan 1699.—800.

Newcastle-under-Line, Staffordshire. 27 Edw. III.

Lord Viscount Chewton Arch. Macdonald, esq.

Sir John Wrottesley, bart.

died 1778

Visc. Trentbam re-elected

(Before the charter) in the mayor, bailiffs, and common council; and it was resolved, that the late constitution altered not the former custom. 9 April, 1624.—Agreed to be in the mayor, burgeses, and freemen, resident within the borough. 27 Feb. 1705.—500.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Northumberland. 13 Edw. I.

Sir W. Blacket, died 1777

Sir M. W. Ridley, bart. re-elected

Sir J. Trewelyan, bart. And. Rob. Bowes

Thomas Delaval

In the corporation and free burgeses.—2500.

Newport, Cornwall. 7 Edw. VI.

Rt. Hon. Hum. Morice made

his election for Launceston

John Frederick, esq.

Visc. Maitland

Rich. Bull, esq.

John Coghill, esq.

Two vianders, with inhabitants paying scot and lot.—62

Newport, Hants. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Rd. Worsley, bart. re-elected

Hans Sloane, esq.

Hon. John St. John

The mayor, 11 aldermen, and 12 burgeses; in all 24.

Newtown

Newton, Lancashire. 1 Eliz.

Ant. James Keck, esq. Thomas Peter Leigh, esq.
Robert Atherton, esq. Thomas Davenport, esq.
In the free burgesses.—60.

Newton, Hants. 27 Eliz.

Sir Jn. Barrington, bart. va-
cated, 1775
Ed. Meux Worsley, esq. re-elected
Harcourt Powell, esq. va-
cated 1775

Charles Ambler, esq. John Barrington, esq.
In the mayor and burgesses of the said borough, having bo-
rough lands within the said borough, 22 April, 1729.—12.
Norfolk.

Sir Edw. Aspley, bart. re-elected
Wenman Coke, esq. died in
1776

Tbo. Wm. Coke, esq. re-elected
Northallerton, Yorkshire. 26 Edw. I. 16 Car. I.
Daniel Lascelles, esq. re-elected, vacated in 1780
Edwin Lascelles, esq.
Henry Pierse, esq. re-elected

In the burgage-holders.—180.

Northamptonshire.

Lucey Knightley, esq. re-elected
Thomas Powys, esq. re-elected

Northampton Town. 20 Edw. I.

Sir G. Robinson, bart. Visc. Althorpe
Hon. W. Tollemache George Rodney, esq.
In the inhabitants being householders, and not receiving
alms; and the sharing in the charitable gift distributed at
Christmas, is a taking of alms. 26 April, 1665.—800.

Northumberland.

Lord Algern. Percy re-elected
Sir W. Middleton, bart. re-elected
Norwich City. 23 Edw. I.
Sir Harb. Harbord, bt. 1382
Edward Bacon, esq. 1199
John Thurlow 1103
W. Windham 1069

In the freeholders, and such fr emen only, as are entered
in

in the books, and do not receive alms. 12 March, 1701
—3000.

Nottinghamshire.

The Earl of Lincoln died in

1778

Hon. T. Willoughby a peer,

1774

Lord Edw. Bentinck

re-elected

Cba. Meadows, esq.

re-elected

Nottingham, Town of

Hon. Wm. Howe

Sir C. Sedley, bt. died 1778

Robert Smith, esq.

57

Abel Smith, esq. died 1779

Dan. Parker Coke, esq.

34

Robert Smith, esq.

J. Cartwright, esq.

15

Agreed to be in the mayor, freemen, and freeholders 40s. per annum.—It was also agreed, that the eldest son of freemen by their birth, the youngest sons of freemen who have served seven years apprenticeship, whether in Nottingham, or elsewhere; and also such persons as served apprenticeship to any freemen of Nottingham, were well entitled to demand their freedom. 10 June, 1701.—1800

Oakhampton. 23 Edw. I. 7 Edw. II. 16 Car. I.

Rich. Vernon, esq.

re-elected

Alex. Wedderburne, esq. vacated in 1778, now Lord

Loughborough

Humpbry Minchin, esq.

re-elected

Charles Philip Jennings, esq.

Rich. Heavyside, esq.

In the freeholders, and freemen, being made free according to the charter and bye-laws of the said borough. 24 Feb. 1710.—400.

Orford, Suffolk. 23 Edw. I.

Lord Visc. Beauchamp

re-elected

Hon. R. Seymour Conway

re-elected

In the mayor, portmen, capital burgeses, and freemen receiving alms. 10 Feb. 1669. 29 Jan. 1708.—80.

Oxfordshire.

Rt. Hon. Lord C. Spencer

re-elected

Rt. Hon. Lord Viscount Wenman

re-elected

Oxf

Oxford City. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Peregrine Bertie

re-elected

Lord Robert Spencer

re-elected

Benj. Bond Hopkins, esq.

Is stated to be in the mayor, 15 more, called the magistrates, and common council, making in all 48.—19 Feb. 18 Jac.

Oxford University. 1 James I.

Sir R. Newdigate, bart.

Sir Wm. Dolben, bart.

Francis Page, esq.

re-elected

In the doctors and actual masters.—450.

Pembrokeshire.

Hugh Owen, esq.

re-elected

Pembroke, Town of

Hugh Owen, esq.

re-elected

1089

Lord Milford

912

In the mayor, bailiffs, and burgesses of the several boroughs of Pembroke, Tenby, and Whiston. 23 Feb. 1711.—500.

Penryn, Cornwall. 7 Edw. VI.

Sir G. Osborne, bart.

Sir F. Bassett, bart.

118

Wm. Chaytor, esq.

John Rogers, esq.

101

W. Chaytor

82

P. Wentworth

44

In the mayor, portreeve, aldermen, and inhabitants paying scot and lot.—140.

Peterborough City. 1 Edw. VI.

Mat. Wyldbore, esq.

James Phipps, esq.

Rich. Benyon, esq.

re-elected

Agreed to be in the inhabitants paying scot and lot. 16 June, 1701.—The execution and return of the precept was resolved to be in the bailiff appointed by the dean and chapter. 9 April 1728.—The right of electing burgesses to parliament was resolved to be in the inhabitants within the precincts of the minster there, being householders not receiving alms; and in the other inhabitants within the city, paying scot and lot. 13 May, 1728.—400.

Petersfield, Hants. 25 Edw. I.

Wm. Jolliffe, esq.

re-elected

Sir Abra. Hume, bart.

Samuel Jolliffe, esq.

Is in the freeholders of lands, or ancient dwelling-houses or shambles, or dwelling-houses or shambles built upon ancient

cient foundations, within the said borough. 9 May, 1727
—150.

Plympton, Devonshire. 23 Edw. I.

Paul Henry Curry, esq. vacated 1775

John Durand, esq.

Sir R. Phillips, bart. now
Ld. Milford, vacated 1779

Viscount Cranburn, succeeded
his father as Earl of Salisbury in 1780

Hon. James Stuart

Sir Ralph Payne

William Fullarton, esq.

In the mayor, bailiff, and freemen, and in the sons of
freemen, who have a right to demand their freedom. 28
Jan. 1702.—200.

Plymouth, Devonshire. 26 Edw. I. 20 Hen. VI.

Visc. Barrington, vacated in
1778

Lord Lewisham

Sir Cha. Hardy, died 1780

Sir F. L. Rogers, bart. 162

George Darby 123

J. Culme 76

Sir G. B. Rodney 21

In the mayor and commonalty. 9 June, 1660.—500.

Resolved, that the word *commonalty* above mentioned, extends only to the freemen of the said borough. 17 Jan. 1739.

Pontefract, Yorkshire. 23, 26 Edw. I. Ja. I.

Sir J. Goodricke, bart.

Visc. Galway

Charles Mellish, esq.

Wm. Nedham, esq.

Ought to be by the inhabitants (householders) resident there.
28 May, 1624.—Is in the persons having, within the said
borough, a freehold of burgage tenure, paying a burgage rent.
6. Feb. 1770.—150.

Poole, Dorsetshire. 36 Edw. III. 31 Hen. VI.

Sir Eyre Coote, K. B.

Joseph Gilstone, esq.

Joshua Mauger, esq.

William Morton Pitt, esq.

Joshua Mauger, esq.

John Adams, esq.

In the out-burgesses as well as in-burgesses. 15 June, 1661.
—100.—Resolved by the committee to be in the mayor, bur-
gesses and commonalty, who pay scot and lot. 9 Feb. 1688.
—To which the house disagreed.

Portsmouth,

Portsmouth, Hants. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Edward Hawke, K. B.

created a Peer in 1776

Maurice Suckling, esq, died
1778

Hon. R. Monckton

re-elected

31

Peter Taylor, esq died 1777

Sir Wm. Gordon, K. B.

re-elected

20

Sir H. Featherstonhaugh

11

In the mayor, aldermen and burgessees. 24 Jan. 1695.

Preston, Lancashire. 23 Edw. I. Edw. VI.

Sir H. Hoghton, bart.

re elected

487

John Burgoyne, esq.

re-elected

466

— Fenton

208

Is in all the inhabitants. 18 Dec. 1661.—600.

It was determined that the words, *all the inhabitants*, did not mean only the in-burgessees of the last guild, or those admitted since by copy of court-roll, as are inhabitants of the said place, but all the inhabitants at large. 29 Nov. 1770.

Queensborough, Kent. 13 Eliz.

Sir C. Frederick, K. B.

re-elected

Sir W. Rawlinson, kt.

re-elected

In the mayor, jurats and bailiffs only. 17 April, 1729.

—70.

Radnorshire.

Thomas Johnes, esq.

re-elected

New Radnor.

Edward Lewis, esq.

Edward Lewis, esq.

John Lewis, esq.

A double return.

In the burgessees of Radnor, Ryader, Knighton, Knuck-
us, and Kevenlice only. 12 Nov. 1690.—600.

Reading, Berkshire. 23 Edw. I.

John Dodd, esq.

re-elected

317

Fr. Anesley, esq.

re-elected

350

Hon. T. Luttrell

199

In the freemen and inhabitants, such freemen not receiving alms, and such inhabitants paying scot and lot. 2 Dec. 1708.—Is in the inhabitants only, paying scot and lot. 10 May, 1716.—560.

East

East Retford, Nottinghamshire. 9 Edw. II.

Sir Cecil Wray, bart.

Wharton Amcotts, esq.

Lord T. P. Clinton, made his
election for Westminster

Hon. Wm. Hanger, vacate

1778

Lord J. P. Clinton

re-elected

The younger sons of freemen have not a right to demand their freedom of the said borough. 17 March, 1701.—In the burgesses, resident and non-resident. 15 April, 1701.—Persons not inhabiting in the said borough, are incapable of being made free by redemption; and the sons of freemen have a right of freedom. 28 Nov. 1702.—Is in freemen only as have a right to their freedom by birth, eldest sons of freemen, or by serving seven years apprenticeship, or have it by redemption, whether inhabiting or inhabiting in the borough at the time of their being made free. 17 Jan. 1705.—Resolved to be in such freemen only as have a right to their freedom by birth, as eldest sons of freemen, or by serving seven years apprenticeship, or have it by redemption, inhabiting in the said borough at the time of their being made free. 11 Jan. 1710.—150.

Richmond, Yorkshire. 19 Eliz.

Sir Lawrence Dundas, bart.

re-elected

made his election for Edinburgh

William Norton, esq.

Thomas Dundas, esq. made
his election for Stirling-
shire

Charles Dundas, esq.

Marquis of Graham

In such persons only as are owners of ancient burgage in the said borough, having a right of pasture in a common field, called Whitcliff pasture. 9 March, 1727.—270.

Ripon, Yorkshire. 23 Edw. I.

Wm. Aislaby, esq.

re-elected

Charles Allanson, esq. died

1775

William Lawrence, esq.

Hon. Frederick Robinson

In the Inhabitants.—200.

Rochester, Kent. 23 Edw. I.

George Finch Hatton, esq.	re-elected	331
Robert Gregory, esq.	re-elected	319
	N. Smith	281

In the citizens.—800.

New Romney, Kent. 42 Edw. III.

Sir Edward Dering, bart.	re-elected
Richard Jackson, esq.	re-elected

In the mayor, 5 jurats, and 26 freemen.—32.

Rutlandshire.

Thomas Noel, esq.	re-elected
George B. Brudenell, esq.	re-elected

Rye, Suffex, 42 Edw. III.

M. Onslow, esq. vacated in

1775

Hon. T. Onslow	re-elected
----------------	------------

Rose Fuller, esq. died 1777

William Dickenson, esq.	re-elected
-------------------------	------------

Is in the mayor, jurats and freemen, inhabiting in the said
port, and paying scot and lot. 19 Dec. 1702.—100.

Ryegate, Surrey. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. John Yorke	re-elected
Sir Charles Cocks	re-elected

In the freeholders.—200.

Salop, or Shropshire.

Noel Hill, esq.	re-elected
Charles Baldwyn, esq.	Richard Hill, esq.

Saltafb, Cornwall. Edw. VI.

Sir Grey Cooper, bart.	re-elected
------------------------	------------

Thomas Bradshaw, esq. died

1778

Henry Starchey, esq.	Charles Jenkinson, esq.
----------------------	-------------------------

Sir Wm. James, bart.

John Buller, jun.

In the mayor, recorder, six aldermen, and twenty freehol-
ders.

Sandwich, Kent. 42 Edw. III.

Wm. Hey, esq. vacated in	Philip Stephens, esq.	477
1776	Sir Rich. Sutton, bart.	366
Charles Brett, esq.	C. Brett	302

Philip Stephen, esq.

In the freemen resiant, and non-resiant, except those
who receive alms.—700.

New Sarum, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Viscount Folkestone, Earl of
Radnor in 1776.

Hon. W. Bouverie re-elected
Wm. Hussey, esq. re-elected

Is in the select number, i. e. the mayor and corporation
consisting of 56 persons. 1 April, 1689.

Old Sarum, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Thomas Pitt, esq. re-elected
Pink. Wilkinson, esq. re-elected

In the freeholders, being burgage-holders of the said bo-
rough. 14 Nov. 1688.—7.

Scarborough, Yorkshire. 23 Edw. III.

Sir Hugh Palliser, bart. va-
cated in 1779

Hon. Charles Phipps, esq. re-elected
Earl of Tyrconnet re-elected

Seaford, Sussex. 42 Edw. III.

Lord Visc. Gage *John Durand, esq.*
George Medley, esq. *John Robinson, esq.*

John Malesworth
George Medley
Mr. Robinson made his elec-
tion for Harwich
C. D'Oyley elect. in his room

Is not only in the bailiffs, jurors, and freemen, but in
the popularity also. 10 Feb. 1670.

Sbaftebury, Dorsetshire. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Wm. Mortimer, esq. Sir G. Rumbold, bart.
George Rous, esq. Francis Sykes, esq.
Hans Wintrop Mortimer, esq.
Sir Geo. Collier

Not only in the mayor and burgesses, but in the inhabi-
tants paying scot and lot. 29 Feb. 1695.—300.

Shoreham, Sussex. 23 Edw. I.

Sir John Shelley, bart. Sir Cecil Blisshopp, bart.
Charles Goring, esq. John Peachey, esq.

All the freeholders of 40s. per annum in the rape or hun-
dred of Bramber, in which Shoreham is situated, have a right
to vote. Act of 1771.—1500.

Sbrowbury, Shropshire. 23 Edw. I.

Rt. Hon. Lord Clive, died
John Corbet, esq. Sir Charlt. Leighton, bart.
William Pulteney, esq. re-elected.

In the burgesſes inhabiting in the ſaid borough, or in the ſuburbs thereof, paying ſcot and lot, and not receiving alms or charity. 20 Dec. 1709. 9 April, 1723.—Is in the mayor, aldermen, and burgesſes. 27 May, 1714.—500.—N. B. Several pariſhes and villages were voted to be no part of the ancient borough or ſuburbs. 9 April, 1723.

Somerſetſhire.

Rich. Hip. Coxe, eſq. re-elected
Edward Philips, eſq. Sir John Trevelyan, bart.

Southampton Town. 23 Edw. I.

Rt. Hon. Hans Stanley, died
1780.

John Fuller, eſq.	re-elected	264
John Fleming, eſq.	Hans Sloane, eſq.	249
	John Fleming	237

In the burgesſes and inhabitants. 31 Dec. 1689.—Resolved, that the out-living burgesſes, as well as the burgesſes (inhabitants) paying ſcot and lot, had a right to vote. 17 March, 1695.—400.—Mayor and bailiffs are the returning officers. April 3 1735.

Southwark, Borough of. 23 Edw. I.

Henry Thrale, eſq.	Sir Rich. Hotham, kt.	1300
Nat. Polhill, eſq.	re-elected	1138
	Hen. Thrale	855

Is only in the inhabitants paying ſcot and lot. 10 Nov. 1702.—1500.

Staffordſhire.

Sir John Wrottesley, bart. re-elected
Sir Wm. Bagot, bart. Viſcount Lewiſham

Stafford Town. 23 Edw. I.

Rich. Whitworth, eſq.	Hon. Edw. Monckton	258
Hugo Meynell, eſq.	Rich. Brinsley Sheridan,	247
	Rich. Whitworth	168
	Drummond	46

In the mayor, aldermen, and burgesſes reſiant within the borough. 27 Nov. 1722.—400.

Stamford, Lincolnſhire. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Geo. Howard, K. B. re-elected
Henry Cecil, eſq. re-elected

In the inhabitants paying ſcot and lot, and not receiving alms, or public charities. 28 March, 1735.—500.

Steving, Sussex. 4 Edw. II.

Th. Ed. Freeman, esq.
Film. Honywood, esq.

Sir T. G. Shipwith, bart.
re-elected, made his election
for Kent

John Bullock, esq.

Agreed to be in the inhabitants paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms. 10 April, 1701.—Agreed to be in the constables and householders (inhabitants) within the borough, paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms. 1 Feb. 1710.—80.

Stockbridge, Hants. 1 Eliz.

Lord Irnham

Hon. John Luttrell, vacated re-elected
in 1775

Hon. Ja. Luttrell

re-elected

R. Mayne

Sir Willoughby Aston

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot.—70.

Sudbury, Suffolk. 1 Eliz.

Sir Patrick Blake, bart.

re-elected

Sir Wal. Hanmer, bart.

P. C. Crespigny, esq.

Sir James Marriott

John Hanniker, esq.

Only in the sons of freemen born after their fathers were made free, and in such as have served seven years apprenticeship, or made freemen by redemption. 6 Dec. 1703.

Suffolk.

Rowland Holt, esq.

Sir John Rous, bart.

Sir T. C. Bunbury, bart.

re-elected

Surrey.

Sir F. Vincent, bt. died 1775

Sir J. Mawbey

24

J. Scawen, esq.

Hon. Augustus Keppel

217

Sir J. Mawbey, bart.

Hon. T. Onslow

150

Suffex.

Lord Geo. H. Lennox

re-elected

Sir T. S. Wilson

Hon. T. Pelham, esq.

Tamworth, Staffordshire. 5 Eliz.

Edw. Thurlow, esq. Lord

Chancellor 1778

Anthony Chamier, esq.

re-elected, died in 1780

T. De Grey, jun. esq.

John Calvert, esq.

John Courtney, esq.

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot, and in such persons as have freeholds within the borough, whether resident

the borough, or not. 17 March, 1698.—In the inhabitants, being householders, paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms. 23 Jan. 1722.—250.

Tavistock, Devonshire. 23 Edw. I.

Rt. Hon. Richard Rigby re-elected

Hon. R. Fitzpatrick re-elected

In the freeholders of inheritance in possession, inhabiting within the said borough. 13 March, 1695. 4 Feb. 1696. 19 Jan. 1702.—110.

Taunton, Somersetshire. 23 Edw. I.

Alex. Popham, esq. John Roberts, esq.

John Halliday, esq. re-elected

In the inhabitants within the said borough, being potwal-
lers, and not receiving alms or charity. 28 July, 1715.—
300.

Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire. 12 James I.

Sir W. Codrington, bart. re-elected

Joseph Martin, esq. died in
1776

James Martin, esq. re-elected

In the inhabitants paying scot and lot.—500.

Tetford, Norfolk. 1 Edw. VI.

Hon. Ch. Fitzroy Richard Hopkins, esq.

C. F. Scudamore, esq. re-elected

In the mayor, burgesses (which are ten) and in the com-
monalty, or common council, (which are twenty) amount-
ing in the whole to thirty-one. 7 June, 1685.

Thirsk, Yorkshire. 23 Edw. III. Edw. VI.

Sir T. Frankland, bart. Sir Tho. Gascoigne, bart.

T. Frankland, esq. Beilby Thompson, esq.

In the burgage-holders of Old Thirsk.

Tiverton, Devonshire. James I.

Nat. Rider, esq. Lord Har-
rowby in 1776

John Wilmot, esq. re-elected

Sir John Duntz, bart. re-elected

In the mayor, recorder, burgesses, and assistants.—26.

Totness, Devonshire. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Philip Jennings Clerke, re-elected
bart.

James Amyatt, esq. Launcelot Brown, esq.

In the freemen not inhabiting, as well as freemen inha-
biting within the said borough. 4 Mar. 1695.—137.

Tregony, Cornwall. Edw. I. 5 Eliz.

Hon. G. L. Parker John Stephenson, esq.
Sir Alexander Leith, bart. John Dawcs, esq.

Agreed to be in all the inhabitants that provide for themselves, whether they live under the same roof or not.

March, 1695.—100.

Truro, Cornwall. 23 Edward I.

George Boscawen, esq. Henry Rosewarne
Bamber Gascoyne, esq. re-elected

In the mayor and select number of burgeses. 21 Mar 1689.—26.

Wallingford, Berkshire. 23 Edw. I.

Sir Robert Barker, knt. John Aubrey, esq.
John Cator, esq. Chaloner Arcedeckne, esq.

In the mayor, aldermen, bailiffs, and eighteen assistants together with the inhabitants of the said borough, paying scot and lot, and not receiving alms. 15 Dec. 1709.—150.

Wareham, Dorsetshire. 30 Edw. I.

Right Hon. William Gerard Thomas Farrer, esq.
Hamilton

Christ. Doyley, esq. John Boyd, esq.

In the mayor, magistrates, and freeholders, and all that pay scot and lot. 25 June, 1661.—Is only in the mayor and magistrates of the said borough as pay scot and lot, and in the freeholders of lands or tenements there, who have been, *bona fide*, to their own use, in the actual occupation, or in the receipts of the rents and profits of such lands or tenements, for the space of one whole year next before the election, except the same came to such freeholders by descent, devise, marriage, marriage-settlement, or promotion to some benefice of the church. 19 Jan. 1747.—150.

Warwickshire.

Sir Charles Holt, bart. Sir Robert Lawley, bart.
T. George Shipwith, esq. Sir George Shuckburg, bart.

Warwick Town. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Char. Fra. Greville re-elected
Hon. Rob. Fulke Greville Robert Ladbrooke, esq.
Hon. R. Greville

In the commonalty of the said town. 3 May, 1628.—Is in such persons only as do pay to church and poor in the said borough, 31 Jan. 1722.—500.

Wa

Wells City. 23 Edw. I.

Clement Tudway, esq.	Clement Tudway	126
Robert Child, esq.	Robert Child	105
	G. Lovell	52

Is in the mayor, masters, and burgeses of the said city. 18 Feb. 1695.—*N. B.* The bye-law of 1712, for inflicting penalties on the mayor and burgeses, declared to be arbitrary and illegal. 30 May, 1716.—Resolved to be in the mayor, masters, and burgeses, and in such persons as are (by consent of the mayor and common-council) admitted to their freedom in any of the seven trading companies, on account of birth, servitude, or marriage. 2 May, 1723.—The same resolution. 18 April, 1729.—The same again. 11 March, 1734.—500.

Wendover, Bucks. 28 Edw. I. 21 Ja. I.

John Adams esq. made his election for Caermarthen

Henry Drummond, esq.

Joseph Bullock, esq. vacated

Thomas Dummer, esq.

Richard Smith, esq.

John Mansell Smith, esq.

Sir John Elliot

Richard Heavyside, esq.

Agreed to be in the inhabitants (housekeepers within the borough) not receiving alms. But persons coming by certificate to live in the borough have not a right to vote. 21 Nov. 1702.—160.

Wenlock, Shropshire. Edw. IV.

Sir H. Bridgman, bart.

Geo. Forester, esq.

re-elected

Tho. Whitmore, esq. made his election for Bridgnorth.
George Forrester, esq.

In the burgeses.—100.

Weobley, Herefordshire.

23 Edw. I. 16 Car. I.
re-elected

S. Leger Douglas, esq.

Sir Wm. Lynch, K.B. vacated

in 1780

Andrew Bayntun, esq.

re-elected

Agreed to be in the inhabitants of houses of 20s. *per ann.* paying scot and lot. 13 Jan. 1698.—Resolved to be in the inhabitants of the ancient vote-houses of 20s. *per ann.* value and upwards, residing in the said houses forty days before the day of election, and paying scot and lot; and also in the

the owners of such ancient vote-houses, paying scot and lot who shall be resident in such houses at the time of the election. 3 March, 1736.—85.

Westbury, Wilts. 27 Hen. VI.

N. Bayly, esq. vacated 1779.

Sam. Estwick, esq.

re-elected

Hon. T. F. Wenman

John Whalley Gardiner, esq.

Resolved that the tenants of burgage-houses, by lease for years absolute, have a right to vote. 1 Dec. 1702.—Is every tenant of any burgage tenement in fee, for life, or ninety nine years, determinable upon lives, or by copy of court roll, paying a burgage-rent of 4d. or 2d. yearly, being resident in the borough, and not receiving alms. 1 June, 1711.—50.

Westlloo, Cornwall. Edw. VI.

Wm. James, esq.

re-elected

G. Ogilvy, esq. vacated 1775

John Rogers, esq.

John Buller, esq.

In the mayor, aldermen, burgesses, and freemen.—53.

Westminster City. 1 Edw. VI.

Earl Percy, baron Percy 1776

Lord Peterham, a peer in 1779

Lord Malden

Hon. Cha. James Fox 48

Lord T. P. Clinton

Sir G. B. Rodney, bart. 52

Lord Lincoln

42

Inhabitants paying scot and lot. The King's menial servants, having no proper houses of their own in Westminster, have no right to vote. 15 Nov. 1680.—11,000.

Westmoreland.

Sir Ja. Lowther, bart. made his election for Cumberland

James Lowther, esq.

re-elected

Sir Mic. Le Fleming, bart.

re-elected

Weymouth. 12 Edw. II. and *Melcombe Regis*, 8 Edw. I.

United by Elizabeth into one corporation, though two boroughs, and send four members.

Right Hon. Wellbore Ellis

re-elected

W. Chaslin Grove, esq.

re-elected

John Purling, esq.

re-elected

John Tucker, esq. died 1778

Gabriel Stewart, esq.

Warren Lisle, esq. vacated

1780

Gabriel Stewart

Agre

Agreed to be in the mayor, aldermen, bailiffs, and capital burgessees, inhabiting in the borough, and in persons seised of freeholds within the borough, and not receiving alms, May, 1730.—400.

Whitchurch, Hampshire. 27 Eliz.

Rt. Hon. T. Townshend re-elected

Lord Viscount Midleton re-elected

In the freeholders only of lands or tenements, in right of themselves, or their wives, not split since the act of the 7th and 8th years of the reign of King William. 21 Dec. 1708.—70.

Wigan, Lancashire. 23 Edw. I. 1 Edw. VI.

Geo. Byng, esq. Hon. Horatio Walpole 36

Geo. Hotham, esq. vacated

in 1775

John Moreton, esq. deceased H. Samp. Bridgeman, esq. 58

Sir Rob. Clayton 33

In the free burgessees.—200.

Wilton, Wilts. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Nich. Herbert died 1775

Charles Herbert, esq.

Lord Herbert

Henry Herbert, esq.

Rt. Hon. W. G. Hamilton

Agreed to be in the mayor and burgessees, who are to do all corporate acts, and receive the sacrament. 28 Nov. 1708.

7 March, 1710.—80.

Wiltshire.

Ambrose Goddard, esq. re-elected

Cha. Penruddocke, esq. re-elected

Winchelsea, Suffex. 42 Edw. III.

C. Wolf, Cornwall, esq. re-elected

Arn. Nesbitt, esq. made his

election for Cricklade

William Nesbit, esq.

John Nesbit, esq.

Agreed to be in the mayor, jurats, and freemen, 11 Feb. 1711.—40.

Winchester City. 23 Edw. I.

Henry Penton, esq. re-elected

Novel Stanhope, esq. re-elected

Stated to be in the mayor, recorder, aldermen, bailiffs, and corporation. 20 Oct. 1690.

Wind-

Agre-

Windsor, Berks. 5 Edw. I.

Hon. Aug. Keppell

P. Portlock Powney, esq.

Hon. John Montague

re-elected

Hon. A. Keppell

In the inhabitants who pay scot and lot. 4 Nov. 16
 —In the mayor, bailiffs, and select number of burge
 only. 2 May, 1689.—Is not in the mayor, bailiffs
 burgeses; but that all the inhabitants have the right
 electing. 5 April, 1697.—300.

Woodstock, Oxfordshire. 30 Edw. I.

John Skinner, esq. vacated
 in 1777

Lord Parker

re-elected

William Eden, esq.

re-elected

In the mayor, aldermen, and freemen of the said borow
 16 March, 1714.—400.

Worcestershire.

Rt. Hon. W. Dowdeswell died
 in 1775

W. Lygon, esq.

re-elected

Hon. Edw. Foley

re-elected

Worcester City. 23 Edw. I.

T. Bates Rous, esq.

re-elected

John Walsh, esq.

Hon. William Ward

Sir W. Lewes

Agreed to be in the freemen not receiving alms. 7 Feb. 16
 In the citizens not receiving alms, and admitted to their fr
 dom by birth or servitude, or by redemption, in order to t
 within the said city. 11 Feb. 1747.—2000.

Wotton Bassett, Wiltshire. 25 Hen. VI.

Hon. Henry St. John

re-elected

Robert Scott, esq.

William Strahan, esq.

Is in the principal inhabitants.—150.

Chipping-Wycomb, Bucks. 28 Edw. I.

Rob. Waller, esq.

re-elected

Hon. T. Fitzmaurice

Lord Mahon

Agreed to be in the mayor, bailiffs, and burgeses,
 receiving alms. 28 Jan. 1702.—170.

Yarmouth, Norfolk. 23 Edw. I.

Cha. Townshend, esq.

re-elected

Hon. Richard Walpole

re-elected

Is in the burgeses at large.—730.

Yarmouth, Hampshire. 23 Edw. I.

Mr. Clarke, esq. vacated 1779

Mr. Kingsmill, esq.

Edward Morant, esq.

Mr. Worley, esq. vacated 1775

Mr. Worley, esq.

Edward Rushworth, esq.

The bye-law, made Sept. 21, 1670, for electing free-burgesses, by the mayor and five chief burgesses, was a good law. 11 April, 1717.—50.

Yorkshire.

Mr. Geo. Savile, bart.

re-elected

Mr. Lascelles, esq.

Henry Duncombe, esq.

Persons whose freeholds lie in the Ainsty have a right to vote. 9 March, 1735.

York City. 23 Edw. I.

Hon. Lord J. Cavendish

re-elected

Mr. Turner, esq.

re-elected

Persons in the corporation and citizens.—1500.

WALES, by an act 27 Hen. VIII.

RECAPITULATION—The first summons for Representatives for Counties (and some Cities) was the 49th of Hen. III. The first returns for shires, on record, 18th of Edward I. First returns for Cities and Boroughs, 23 Edw. I. 14 Counties, Cities, and Boroughs, sent Representatives to Parliament at the accession of Hen. VIII. 31 were added by Henry VIII.

27 by Edward VI.

14 by Mary

31 by Elizabeth

14 by James I.

8 by Charles I.

4 by Charles II.

45 by Anne, for Scotland.

S C O T L A N D.

Aberdeenshire.

Mr. Garden, esq.

re-elected

County

David Kennedy, esq.

County of Air.

Hugh Montgomery

Sir Adam Fergusson, bart.

Argyllshire.

Robert Campbell, esq. vacated in 1771

Adam Livingstone, esq.

Lord Frederick Campbell

Aberbrothick, Aberdeen, &c.

Hon. T. Lyon, died 1778

Adam Drummond, esq.

re-elected

Bamfshire.

R. H. Ja. Duff, Earl of Fife

re-elected

Berwickshire.

James Pringle, jun. esq. vacated

1779

Sir John Paterson, bart.

Hugh Scott, jun. esq.

Sir John Paterson, bart.

Bute and Caithnessshire.

Hon. James Stuart

John Sinclair, esq.

Nairn and Cromartie Shires.

Cosmo Gordon, esq.

Mr. Gordon vacated in 1777

John Campbell, esq.

George Ross

Craill, Kinrenny, &c.

Phil. Anstruther, esq. vacated

in 1777

Hon. George Damer

Sir John Anstruther, bart.

Cupar, Perth, &c.

George Dempster, esq.

re-elected

Lord Fred. Campbell

Dumbartonshire.

Sir Arch. Edmonstone, bart.

Lord Fred. Campbell

— *Elphinstone**Culrofs, Dumferline, &c.*

James Campbell

Dumfrieshire.

Sir Robert Laurie, bart.

re-elected

Edinburghshire.

H. Dundas, esq.

re-elected

Edinburgh City.

Sir Laurence Dundas

re-elected

Will. Miller, jun. esq.

Elginshire.

Hon. Art. Duff, vacated 1779

Lord Will. Gordon re-elected

Fifehire.

John Scott, esq. died 1776

J. T. Oswald, esq. vacated 1779

Rob. Skene, esq. re-elected

Forfarshire.

Earl of Panmure re-elected

Glasgow, Dumbarton, &c.

Lord Fred. Campbell John Crauford

Wm. Fullarton, esq.

Haddingtonshire.

Sir G. Suttie, bart. vac. 1777

Well. Nesbit, esq. Hugh Dalrymple, esq.

Invernesshire.

Hon. Simon Fraser re-elected

Inverness, Nairn, &c.

Sir Hector Monro

Irvine, Air, Rothesay, &c.

Sir J. A. Edmondstone

Kincardineshire.

Lord Adam Gordon re-elected

Kinross and Clackmannan Counties.

George Graham

Kintore, Banff, &c.

Sta. Long Morris, esq. re-elected

James Grant, esq.

Kirkaldy, Bruntisland, &c.

John Johnstone, esq. John Henderson, jun. esq.

Henry Dundas, esq.

Kirkudbright, Stewartry.

Wm. Stewart, esq. Peter Johnston, esq.

John Gordon, esq.

Lanarkshire.

And. Stewart, esq. re-elected

Linlithgowshire.

Sir W. A. Cunynghame, bart. re-elected

Lauder, Haddington, &c.

Hon. J. Maitland. died 1779

Francis Charteris, esq. re-elected

Lochmaben, Dumfries, &c.

William Douglas, jun. esq. Sir Rob. Herries, knt.

E

Orkney

Orkney and Zetlandshire.

Thomas Dundas, esq.

Robert Backie
Chas. Dundas, esq.
Peeblesshire.

Lord Advocate vacated 1775

Ad. Hay, esq. died 1775

Sir R. M. Keith, K. B. Alex. Murray, esq.

Pertbshire.

Hon. James Murray re-elected

Renfrewshire.

John Craufurd, esq.

John Shaw Stewart, esq.

Rosshire.

Rt. Hon. J. S. Mackenzie Hon. J. Mackenzie

Roxburghshire.

Rt. Hon. Sir G. Elliot, bt.

died in 1777

Sir G. Elliot, his son

re-elected

Lord Rob. Kerr

Selkirkshire.

John Pringle, esq.

re-elected

— *Selkirk, esq.*

Selkirk, Lanerk, Peebles, &c.

Sir James Cockburn

Stirlingshire.

Thomas Dundas, esq.

re-elected

Stranrawer, Wigtown, Whiteborn, &c.

W. Adam

Sutherlandshire.

Hon. James Wemyss

re-elected

Wigtownshire.

Hon. Keith Stewart

re-elected

Wick, Tayn, &c.

James Grant, esq.

Hon. Charles Ross

PEERS OF SCOTLAND.

Elected in 1774.

Elected in 1780.

Duke of Gordon

re-elected

Earl of Galloway

re-elected

Earl of Dunmore

re-elected

Earl of Dalhousie

re-elected

Earl of Breadalbane

Duke of Athol

Earl of Englingtoun

re-elected

Earl of Abercorn

re-elected

Earl of Loudoun

re-elected

Earl of Aberdeen	re-elected
Duke of Queensberry	re-elected
Earl of Marchmont	re-elected
Earl of Roseberry	re-elected
Earl of Bute	Earl of Glencairn
Viscount Stormont	re-elected
Marquis of Lothian	re-elected
Earl of Cassilis	re-elected

ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS.

Canterbury. Dr. Thomas Secker, died in August, 1763, when the Hon. Dr. Frederick Cornwallis was translated from Litchfield and Coventry

York. Dr. John Gilbert, died in 1761, and the Hon. Dr. Robert Drummond, translated from Salisbury to this see, in his room, died in 1776, and Dr. Wm. Markham translated from Chester in his room

London. Dr. Thomas Sherlock died in 1761, and was succeeded by Dr. Thomas Hayter, Bishop of Norwich, who died in 1762, when Dr. Richard Osbaldeston was translated from Carlisle, who died in 1764; and on May 22, 1764, Dr. Richard Terrick was translated to the see of London; died April, 1777, and Dr. Robert Lowth translated from Oxford in his room

Burton. Hon. Dr. Richard Trevor, died June 9, 1771, and was succeeded by Dr. Egerton, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry

Linchester. Dr. Benjamin Hoadley died in 1761, and Dr. John Thomas was then translated from Salisbury

Exeter. Dr. Matthias Mawson died November 23, 1770, when Dr. Edmund Keene was translated from Chester to this see.

St. David's. Dr. Edw. Willes died in 1773, and was succeeded by Dr. Charles Moss, Bishop of St. David's.

Salisbury. Dr. John Thomas, translated to Salisbury in 1761, and Dr. John Green consecrated in his room, died in 1779

Hereford. Right Hon. Lord James Beauchamp

Gloucester. Dr. George Lavington, died in 1762, and the Hon.

Dr. Fred. Keppell consecrated in his room, who died Dec. 1777, when Dr. John Ross was consecrated in his room

Carlisle. Dr. Richard Osbaldeston, translated to London in

1762, and Dr. Charles Lyttelton consecrated in his room who died in 1769, and was succeeded by Dr. Edmund Law **Salisbury**. Dr. John Thomas, translated to Winchester in 1761, vice Hoadley, deceased, and was succeeded by the Hon. Dr. Robert Drummond, who was in the same year translated to York, and Dr. John Thomas was translated from Lincoln to Salisbury, who died July 20, 1766, and was succeeded by Dr. John Hume, Bishop of Oxford

Rochester. Dr. Zach. Pearce, died in 1774, when Dr. John Thomas, Dean of Westminster, was consecrated Bishop of Rochester in his room

St. Asaph. Hon. Dr. Robert Drummond, translated in 1761 to Salisbury, and Dr. Richard Newcome translated from Landaff in his room, who died in June, 1769, and was succeeded by Dr. Jonathan Shipley, Bishop of Landaff

Norwich. Dr. Thomas Hayter, translated to London in 1761 and Dr. Philip Younge, Bishop of Bristol, succeeded him

Litchfield and Coventry. Hon. Dr. Frederick Cornwallis translated to Canterbury in August, 1768, and succeeded by Dr. John Egerton, Bishop of Bangor, who, in June 1771, was translated to Durham, and the Hon. Dr. Brownlow North consecrated in his room, translated to Worcester in 1774, and succeeded by Dr. Richard Hurd

Chesh. Dr. Edmond Keene, translated to Ely in December 1770, and Dr. William Markham consecrated in his room. The last translated to York in 1776, and Dr. Beilby Porteus consecrated in his room

Worcester. Dr. James Johnson, died in November, 1774, succeeded by Dr. Brownlow North, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry

St. David's. Dr. Anthony Ellis, died in 1761, and was succeeded by Dr. Samuel Squire, who died May 17, 1771, when Dr. Robert Lowth was consecrated in his room; October following he was translated to Oxford, and Dr. Charles Moss consecrated Bishop of St. David's, who was in 1774, translated to Bath and Wells, and succeeded this see by the Hon. Dr. James Yorke, translated to Gloucester in 1779, and Dr. John Warren consecrated in his room.

Chichester. Dr. (now Sir) William Ashburnham

Landaff. Dr. Richard Newcome, translated to St. Asaph in 1761, and Dr. John Ewer consecrated in his room, who

in December 1768, was translated to Bangor, and was succeeded by Dr. Jonathan Shipley, who, in 1769, was translated to St. Asaph, when the Hon. Dr. Shute Barrington was consecrated Bishop of Landaff.

Oxford. Dr. John Hume, translated in July, 1766, to Salisbury, and Dr. Robert Lowth, Bishop of St. David's, translated to the bishoprick of Oxford. In May, 1777, Dr. John Butler was consecrated Bishop of Oxford in the room of Dr. Lowth, translated to London.

Bangor. Dr. John Egerton, translated in Oct. 1768, to Litchfield and Coventry; and in December following, Dr. John Ewer succeeded him, who died in October, 1774, and was succeeded by Dr. John Moore.

Peterborough. Dr. Richard Terrick, translated in May, 1764, to London, and Dr. Robert Lamb consecrated in his room; Dr. Lamb died in 1768, and Dr. John Hinchliffe was then consecrated Bishop of Peterborough.

Bristol. Dr. Philip Yonge, translated to Norwich in 1761, and Dr. Thomas Newton consecrated in his room.

Gloucester. Dr. William Warburton died in 1779. Hon. Dr. James Yorke translated from St. David.

L O R D - C H A M B E R L A I N,

And his Department.

Lord Chamberlains.

Duke of Devonshire

Nov. 22, 1762, Duke of Marlborough, vice Duke of Devonshire

April 22, 1763, Earl Gower, vice Duke of Marlborough -

July 12, 1765, Duke of Portland, vice Lord Gower

Dec. 4, 1766, Earl of Hertford

Vice-Chamberlains.

Rt. Hon. William Finch

July 12, 1765, Lord Villiers (now Earl of Jersey) vice Finch

Feb. 13, 1770, Hon. Tho. Robinson, vice Earl of Jersey

Feb. 6, 1771, Lord Hinchinbroke, vice Hon. Tho. Robinson, now Lord Grantham

Grooms of the Stole.

Earl of Rochford

Nov. 25, 1760, Earl of Bute, vice Earl of Rochford

- Mar. 25, 1761, Earl of Huntingdon, vice Earl of Bute
 Jan. 29, 1770, Earl of Bristol, vice Earl of Huntingdon
 March 1775, The Earl of Bristol died
 Viscount Weymouth
 Nov. 10, 1775, Earl of Ashburnham

Lords of the Bed-Chamber.

- Duke of Ancafter, Duke of Manchester (late), Marquis
 Rockingham, Earls of Fauconberg, Lincoln, (now Duke
 of Newcastle) Ashburnham, Hertford, Coventry, Hynde-
 ford, Northumberland, (now Duke) Effex, Oxford, Buck-
 inghamshire
 Nov. 25, 1760, Marquis of Caernarvon, Earl of March
 late Earl of Eglington, Visc. Weymouth, Ld. Bruce
 Visc. Downe, Visc. Pulteney, and Lord Robert Bertie
 appointed additional Lords of the Bed-Chamber
 Mar. 25, 1761, Duke of Richmond, vice late Duke of
 Manchester
 Mar. 25, 1761, Earl of Litchfield, vice Lord Fauconberg
 Mar. 25, 1761, Earl of Pembroke, vice Lord Hyndford
 Mar. 25, 1761, Earl of Oxford, vice Earl of Effex
 Nov. 22, 1762, Lord Masham, vice Lord Litchfield
 Nov. 22, 1762, Lord Bolingbroke, vice Lord Downe
 Feb. 1763, Earl of Pomfret, vice Lord Pembroke
 Feb. 1763, Ld. Willoughby de Broke, vice Ld. Pulteney
 Apr. 22, 1763, Duke of Manchester, vice Marquis
 Rockingham
 Apr. 22, 1763, Earl of Denbigh, vice D. of Northumberland
 June 1765, Duke of Ancafter ceased to be a Lord
 of the Bed Chamber on being appointed
 Master of the Horse to the Queen
 July 12, 1765, Earl Cornwallis, vice Lord Bolingbroke
 Aug. 1, 1765, Earl of Hertford discontinued as Lord
 of the Bed-Chamber, on being appointed
 Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
 Oct. 5, 1769, Earl of Jersey
 Duke of Roxburgh, Earl of Pembroke
 Lord Viscount Bolingbroke, Marquis
 of Carmarthen
 Feb. 1777, Earl of Fauconberg

- Dec. 1777, Earl of Winchelsea, vice Earl of Jersey
 Earl of Aylesford, vice Marq. Carmarthen
 Sept. 1780, Lord Onslow and Lord Boston

Grooms of the Bed-Chamber.

Lieu. Gen. Campbell, (late Duke of Argyll) Lieut. Gen. Mostyn, Lieut. Gen. Waldegrave (now Earl) Major Gen. Cornwallis, Major Gen. H. S. Conway, Col. Charles Fitzroy, John Offley, esq.

Nov. 25, 1760, George Schutz, Sir James Peachy, Hon. George Monson, Charles Ingram, Edmund Nugent, Wm. Breton, Spencer Compton (now Earl of Northampton) Geo. Pitt, Norb. Berkeley (late Lord Bottetourt) appointed additional Grooms of the Bed-Chamber

May 1, 1761, Henry Seymour, vice Lord Waldegrave

Dec. 1762, James (now Sir) Wright, vice Col. Fitzroy

Dec. 1762, Jn. Mordaunt, vice Jn. Offley

Apr. 22, 1763, Cha. Hotham (now Sir Cha. Thompson) vice Colonel Monson

Apr. 22, 1763, Aug. J. Hervey, vice Lord Northampton.

Apr. 1764. General Conway dismissed

Feb. 1765, Adm. Keppel, vice Lord Bottetourt

Aug. 1765, Hon. Hen. Wallop, vice Henry Seymour

Apr. 26, 1771, Colonel Nugent died

March, 1775, Aug. John Hervey, vacated on the Death of the Earl of Bristol

March, 1775, Hon. Wm. Gordon
 Hon. Col. Wm. Harcourt, Hon. H. Vernon, Sir G. Osborne, bart. Hon. Col. H. St. John, Tho. De Grey, jun. Sir Philip Hales

1779, Col. Lascelles, vice Lieut. Gen. Mostyn

LORD-STEWARD'S DEPARTMENT.

Lord Steward.

Duke of Rutland

Mar. 25, 1761, Earl Talbot, vice Duke of Rutland

Comptrollers.

Lord Edgcumbe (late)

May 22, 1761, Earl Powis, vice late Lord Edgcumbe

Nov. 25, 1761, Lord Geo. Cavendish, vice Lord Powis

Nov.

Nov. 22, 1762, Lord Ch. Spencer, vice Lord Geo. Cavendish
 July 20, 1765, Thomas Pelham (now Lord Pelham) vice
 Lord Cha. Spencer

Nov. 10, 1775, Sir William Meredith, vice Lord Pelham
 Dec. 1777, Lord Onslow, vice Sir W. Meredith
 Nov. 1779, Sir Richard Worsley, vice Lord Onslow
Treasurers.

Lord Thomond

Nov. 25, 1761, Earl Powis, vice Lord Thomond
 July 20, 1765, Lord Edgecumbe, vice Lord Powis
 Nov. 27, 1766, John Shelley (now Sir) vice Lord Edgecumbe
 May 1777, Earl of Carlisle, vice Sir J. Shelley
 Nov. 1779, Lord Onslow, vice Earl of Carlisle
 Sept. 1780, Earl of Salisbury, vice Lord Onslow
Cofferers.

Duke of Leeds

April 3, 1761, James Grenville, vice Duke of Leeds
 Nov. 25, 1761, Lord Thomond, vice James Grenville
 July 20, 1765, Earl of Scarborough, vice Lord Thomond
 Dec. 4, 1766, Hans Stanley, vice Lord Scarborough
 1774, Jer. Dyson, esq. vice Hans Stanley
 1776, Hans Stanley, vice Jer. Dyson, esq.
 Jan. 1780, Lord Beauchamp, vice Hans Stanley
Masters of the Household.

John Harris

Apr. 19, 1768, Hon. Henry Fred. Thynne, vice J. Harris
 Dec. 19, 1770, Sir Fra. Hen. Drake, vice H. F. Thynne
Clerks of the Board of Green Cloth.

Sir Thomas Hales, Sir Fra. Hen. Drake, Hon.
 John Grey, Humphry Morice

Mar. 25, 1761, Tho. Townshend, jun. vice Sir Tho. Hales
 John Evelyn, vice Humphry Morice
 Nov. 25, 1761, Hen. Bridgman (now Sir) and Simon Far-
 shaw, additional Clerks
 Dec. 1762, Hon. Henry Frederick Thynne, vice Tho.
 Townshend
 April, 1764, Richard Vernon, vice Henry Bridgman
 July 20, 1765, Sir Alex. Gilmour, vice Hen. Fred. Thynne
 Hon. Geo. Bridges Brudenell, vice Richard
 Vernon

Dec. 4, 1766, Richard Hopkins, vice John Evelyn.

Apr. Nov.

April 19, 1768, Richard Vernon, vice Simon Fanshaw
 Dec. 19, 1770, Hon. Richard Savage Nassau, (died in Aug.
 1780) vice Sir Francis Henry Drake
 June, 1777, Sir Ralph Payne
 Dec. 1777, Sir Richard Worsley, vice R. Hopkins, esq.
 July, 1779, Sir Wm. Aug. Cunyngname, Bart. vice Sir R.
 Worsley

Oct. 1780, Sir William Gordon, vice
 Lovel Stanhope, esq. vice Hon. R. S. Nassau

MASTERS OF THE HORSE.

Earl Gower

Nov. 25, 1760, Earl of Huntingdon
 Mar. 25, 1761, Duke of Rutland
 Aug. 1766, Earl of Hertford
 Dec. 13, 1766, Duke of Ancafter, died in Oct. 1778.
 Dec. 8, 1778, Duke of Northumberland.
 Jan. 1781, Duke of Montagu

CAPTAINS OF THE BAND OF GENTLEMEN-PENSIONERS.

Lord Berkeley of Stratton

July 17, 1762, Earl of Litchfield
 Dec. 8, 1772, Lord Edgcumbe

CAPTAIN OF THE YEOMEN OF THE GUARD.

Lord Viscount Falmouth

BOARD OF WORKS.

Surveyor General.

Hon. Henry Finch

Dec. 20, 1760, Tho. Worsley, esq. vice Hon. H. Finch.
 July 1777, Whitshed Keene, esq.

Surveyor of the Private Roads.

Dec. 20, 1760, Hon. Edw. Finch Hatton
 July 27, 1771, Tho. Whateley, esq. vice Hon. E. F. Hat-
 ton, deceased

July, 1772, Hen. Fane, esq. vice Whateley deceased
Paymaster of the Works.

George Augustus Selwyn, esq.

Surveyor of the Crown Lands.

Hon. Robert Herbert

1768, Peter Burrel, esq.

Nov. 10, 1775, Hon. John St. John

Surveyor of Gardens, Waters, &c.

Hon. Thomas Hervey

Jan. 20, 1761, George Onslow, esq. (now Lord) vice Hon.
Tho. Hervey

Jan. 20, 1763, Lord Charles Spencer, vice Geo. Onslow

May 7, 1762, John Marthe Dickenson, esq. vice Lord
Charles Spencer

April, 1764, Hon. Cha. Sloane Cadogan, vice Dickenson

Oct. 5, 1769, William Varey, esq. vice Cadogan

KEEPER OF THE GREAT WARDROBE.

Sir Tho. Robinson, (late Lord Grantham)

Nov. 25, 1769, Earl Gower

May 3, 1763, Lord Le Despencer

July 20, 1765, Earl of Ashburnham

Nov. 10, 1775, Lord Pelham

TREASURER OF THE CHAMBER.

Right Hon. Charles Townshend

Mar. 21, 1761, Right Hon. Sir Francis Dashwood (now
Lord Le Despencer)

May 29, 1762, Rt. Hon. Sir Gilbert Elliot

April 12, 1770, Rt. Hon. George Rice, dead.

Nov. 1779, Lord Charles Spencer

MASTER OF THE JEWEL-OFFICE.

Sir Richard Lyttelton

Dec. 1762, Earl of Darlington

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

At the Establishment of the Queen's Household,
Lord Chamberlains.

Earl (now Duke) of Northumberland

April 21, 1763, Earl Harcourt

1768, Earl Delawar

Dec. 1777, Marquis of Carmarthen

Oct. 1780, Lord Southampton

Vice Chamberlains.

Viscount Cantalupe

1768, Hon. Charles Fitzroy, now Ld. Southampton

Masters of the Horse.

Earl Harcourt

April 21, 1763, Viscount Weymouth

May, 1765, Earl Delawar

Jan. 20, 1768, Duke of Beaufort

Nov

1770, Earl Waldegrave

Treasurers.

Andrew Stone, esq. died in 1774, succeeded by the Earl of Guildford

Secretaries.

David Graeme, esq. (now Lieut. Gen.) resigned in 1774, succeeded by Ja. Harris, esq. who was succeeded in 1780 by the Hon. G. A. North

Comptrollers.

Hon. Sewallis Shirley, died October 31, 1765, and succeeded by Gen. Graeme, who resigned in 1774, and was succeeded by Ja. Harris, esq.

Attorney General.

Richard Hufsey, esq. John Morton, esq. died in 1780. (vacant)

Solicitor General.

William Blackstone, deceased

Charles Ambler, esq. appointed in 1771

PRINCE OF WALES, &c.

Earl of Holderness, *Governor*

Dr. Markham, *Preceptor*

Leonard Smelt, esq. *Sub-Governor*

Rev. Cyril Jackson, *Sub-Preceptor*

May, 1776, Lord Bruce (now Earl of Aylesbury) *Gov.*

Dr. Hurd, *Preceptor*

Col. Hotham, *Sub-Governor*

W. Arnald, D. D. *Sub-Preceptor*

June, 1776, Duke of Montagu, *Governor*

1777, Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry, *Sub-Governor*

LORD CHANCELLOR.

At the accession of the present King, Lord Henley was Lord Keeper

Jan. 16, 1761, Lord Henley appointed Lord-Chancellor, and, May 19, 1764, created Earl of Northington

July 30, 1766, Lord Camden appointed Lord-Chancellor

Jan. 17, 1770, Hon. Charles Yorke. Died Jan. 20, 1770

Jan. 22, 1770, Great Seal put into Commission, Sir S. Smythe, Hon. Henry Bathurst, and Sir Rich. Aston, Commissioners

Jan. 23, 1771, Hon. Henry Bathurst created Lord Apsley
(now Earl Bathurst) and appointed Lord
Chancellor resigned in 1778

June 2, 1778, Mr. Thurlow, created Lord Thurlow,
appointed Lord-Chancellor.

LORD-PRESIDENT.

Earl Granville. Died Jan. 2, 1763. Vacant till
Sept. 9, 1763, Duke of Bedford
July 12, 1765, Earl of Winchelsea
July 30, 1766, Earl of Northington
Dec. 23, 1767, Earl Gower
Nov. 1779, Earl Bathurst

LORD-WARDEN OF THE STANNERIES.

Lord Waldegrave, (the late)

Dec. 20, 1762, Humphry Morice, vice Lord Waldegrave

CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER.

Lord Kinnoul

Dec. 15, 1762, Lord Strange, vice Lord Kinnoul

June 14, 1771, Lord Hyde, (now Earl of Clarendon)

Lord Strange

LORD PRIVY SEAL.

Earl Temple

Oct. 12, 1761, In commission. E. Weston, W. Shaftesbury
and Jer. Dyson, Commissioners

Nov. 25, 1761, Duke of Bedford

Apr. 20, 1763, Duke of Marlborough

July 15, 1765, Duke of Newcastle

July 30, 1766, Earl of Chatham

Nov. 2, 1768, Earl of Bristol

Feb. 9, 1770, Earl of Halifax

Jan. 22, 1771, Earl of Suffolk

June 12, 1771, Duke of Grafton

Nov. 10, 1775, Earl of Dartmouth

CHIEF-JUSTICES IN EYRE.

Lord Sandys, North of Trent

Earl of Breadalbane, South of Trent

Apr. 14, 1761, Duke of Leeds, N. of Trent

Nov. 5, 1765, Lord Monson, S. of Trent

Dec. 23, 1766, Earl Cornwallis, S. of Trent

Feb. 19, 1769, Sir Fl. Norton, S. of Trent

1774, Lord Pelham, N. of Trent

Nov. 10, 1775, Lord Lyttelton, N. of Trent, died in November, 1779

Sept. 1780, C. W. Cornwall, esq. vice Ld. Lyttelton
ATTORNEY AND SOLICITOR GENERAL.

At the Accession of the present King,

Attorney,

Charles Pratt, (now Lord Camden)

Dec. 14, 1761, Mr. Yorke, vice Cha Pratt

Nov. 1763, Sir Fl. Norton, vice Mr. Yorke

Aug. 1765, Hon. Charles Yorke, vice Sir Fl. Norton

Aug. 6, 1766, Wm. De Grey, vice Mr. Yorke

Jan. 23, 1771, Ed. Thurlow, vice Mr. De Grey

July 1778, Alexander Wedderburne, (now Ld. Loughborough) vice Mr. Thurlow

Aug. 1780, James Wallace, esq. vice Ld. Loughborough
Solicitor.

Hon. Charles Yorke

Dec. 14, 1761, Fletcher (now Sir) Norton, vice Mr Yorke

Dec. 16, 1764, William De Grey, vice Sir Fletcher Norton

Aug. 1766, Edw. Willes, vice Mr. De Grey

Dec. 23, 1767, Jn. Dunning, vice Ed. Willes

March, 1770, Edw. Thurlow, vice Mr. Dunning

Jan. 23, 1771, Alex. Wedderburne, vice Mr. Thurlow

July, 1778. James Wallace, vice Mr. Wedderburne

Sept. 1780, James Mansfield, esq. vice Mr. Wallace

T R E A S U R Y.

First Lords.

Duke of Newcastle

May 29, 1762, Earl of Bute

Apr. 16, 1763, George Grenville

July 12, 1765, Marquis of Rockingham

Aug. 2, 1766, Duke of Grafton

Jan. 28, 1770, Lord North

Chancellors of the Exchequer.

Hen. Bilson Legge

Mar. 21, 1761, Lord Barrington

May 29, 1762, Sir F. Dashwood, (now Lord Le Despencer)

Apr. 16, 1763, George Grenville

July 12, 1765, William Dowdeswell

Aug. 2, 1766, [Late] Charles Townshend

Sept. 16, 1767, Lord North

Lords of the Treasury.

- James Grenville, Lord North, James Oswald
 Mar. 21. 1761, Gilbert (now Sir Gilbert) Elliot, Bart
 vice James Grenville
 Apr. 16, 1763, Sir John Turner, vice Elliot
 Thomas Orby Hunter, vice Oswald
 James Harris, vice Dashwood
 July 12, 1765, Lord John Cavendish, vice Sir John Turner
 Tho. Townshend, jun. vice Tho. Orby
 Hunter
 George Onslow, vice James Harris
 Aug. 2, 1766, Pryse Campbell, vice Lord John Cavendish
 Dec. 3, 1767, Cha. Jenkinson, vice Tho. Townshend
 Dec. 31, 1768, Jeremiah Dyson, vice Pryse Campbell
 Feb. 6, 1770, Charles Townshend, vice Lord North
 Dec. 1772, Hon. Charles James Fox, vice C. Jenkinson
 1774, Lord Visc. Beauchamp, and Charles Wodehouse
 franc. Cornwall, esqrs. vice Cha. James Fox and Jeremiah Dyson
 June 1777, Lord Westcote, vice C. Townshend
 Dec. 1777, Lord Palmerston, vice Lord Onslow.
 Jan. 1780, Sir R. Sutton, vice Lord Visc. Beauchamp
 Oct. 1780, John Buller, sen. esq. vice C. W. Cornwall, esq.

Joint Secretaries.

James West and Samuel Martin

- May 29, 1762, Jer. Dyson, vice Ja. West
 Apr. 16, 1763, Cha. Jenkinson, vice Samuel Martin
 April 1764, Tho. Whately, vice Jer. Dyson
 July 12, 1765, Cha. Lowndes and Grey (now Sir) Cooper
 vice Jenkinson and Dyson
 Aug. 2, 1766, Thomas Bradshaw, vice Cha. Lowndes
 Feb. 6, 1770, John Robinson, vice Tho. Bradshaw

Secretaries to the first Lord.

- May 29, 1762, Charles Jenkinson
 July 12, 1765, Edmund Burke
 Aug. 2, 1766, Rd. Stonhewer, vice Burke

Secretaries to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

John Buller

- July 12, 1765, Sir Edward Winnington
 Jan. 1770, William Brummell, esq.

Solicitors to the Treasury.

Philip Carteret Webb

July 12, 1765, Thomas Nuthall, vice Philip Carteret Webb
March, 1775, Wm. Chamberlayne, esq. vice T. Nuthall,
deceased

H. V. Jones, esq.

SECRETARIES OF STATE.

Southern Department.

William Pitt, now Lord Chatham, died in 1778

Oct. 9, 1761, Earl of Egremont
Sept. 9, 1763, Earl of Sandwich
July 12, 1765, Henry Seymour Conway
May 23, 1766, Duke of Richmond
Aug. 2, 1766, Earl of Shelburne
Oct. 21, 1768, Lord Weymouth
Dec. 19, 1770, Earl of Rochford
Nov. 10, 1775, Viscount Weymouth
Nov. 1779, Earl of Hillsborough

Northern Department.

Earl of Holderness

Mar. 25, 1761, Earl of Bute
May 29, 1762, George Grenville
Oct. 14, 1762, Earl of Halifax
July 12, 1765, Duke of Grafton
May 23, 1766, Henry Seymour Conway
Jan. 20, 1768, Lord Weymouth
Oct. 21, 1768, Earl of Rochford
Dec. 19, 1770, Earl of Sandwich
Jan. 22, 1771, Earl of Halifax
June 12, 1771, Earl of Suffolk, died in June, 1779
Oct. 27, 1779, Viscount Stormont

For the Colonies.

Jan. 20, 1768, Earl of Hillsborough
Aug. 14, 1772, Earl of Dartmouth
Nov. 10, 1775, Lord Geo. Germain

BOARD OF TRADE

First Lord.

Earl of Halifax

Jan. 21, 1761, Lord Sandys
Jan. 1, 1763, Charles Townshend (the late)
Jan. 20, 1763, Lord Shelburne

Sept. 9, 1763, Lord Hillsborough
 July 20, 1765, Lord Dartmouth
 Aug. 16, 1766, Lord Hillsborough
 Dec. 1766, Lord Clare
 Aug. 31, 1772, Lord Dartmouth
 Nov. 1775, Lord George Germain
 Nov. 1779, Earl of Carlisle

Lords of Trade.

Andrew Stone, Thomas Pelham (now Lord), Soame Jenyns
 Wm. Gerard Hamilton, Wm. Sloper, Ed. Elliot, Ed. Bacon
 Mar. 21, 1761, Hon. J. Yorke, vice Pelham
 Mar. 21, 1761, Sir Edmund Thomas, vice Hamilton
 Mar. 21, 1761, George Rice, vice Sloper
 Oct. 23, 1761, John Roberts, vice Andrew Stone
 Dec. 1762, Lord Orwell, vice J. Roberts
 Apr. 20, 1763, Jeremiah Dyson, vice John Yorke
 April 20, 1763, Bamber Gascoigne, vice Sir Edmund Thomas
 July 20, 1765, Hon. John Yorke, vice Lord Orwell
 July 20, 1765, John Roberts, vice Bamber Gascoigne
 July 20, 1765, William Fitzherbert, vice Edward Bacon
 Dec. 1765, Lord Palmerston, vice John Yorke
 Sept. 1766, Hon. Tho. Robinson (now Lord Grantham) vice Lord Palmerston
 Jan. 20, 1768, Lord Lisburne, vice Jerem. Dyson
 April 12, 1770, Lord Greville, vice Hon. Thomas Robinson (now Lord Grantham)
 April 16, 1770, William Northey, vice Lord Lisburne
 Jan. 26, 1771, Thomas Whately, vice William Northey
 Feb. 11, 1772, William Jollyffe, vice Wm. Fitzherbert
 Aug. 15, 1772, Lord Garlies, vice Thomas Whately
 Aug. 31, 1772, Lord Robert Spencer, vice John Roberts
 1774, Hon. Charles Greville and Whitshed Keene
 Esqrs. vice Lord Greville and Lord Garlies
 June, 1777, Thomas De Grey, vice Whit. Keene
 W. Eden, vice Lord Garlies
 July, 1779, Andrew Stuart and Edward Gibbon, Esqrs.
 vice Messrs. Gascoigne and Jollyffe.
 Oct. 1780, Hans Sloane and Benj. Langlois, vice Soame
 Jenyns and C. F. Greville

PAYMASTER-GENERAL OF THE FORCES.

Right Hon. Henry Fox (afterward Lord Holland)
 June 8, 1765, Right Hon. Charles Townshend

Aug. 2, 1766, Right Hon. Lord North and Geo. Cooke, esq.
 Dec. 3, 1767, Right Hon. T. Townshend, vice Lord North
 June 5, 1768, George Cooke, esq. died
 June 14, 1768, Right Hon. Richard Rigby appointed sole
 paymaster

M I N T.

Warden.

John Jefferies, esq.

1766, Gen. Whitmore

Jan. 1, 1771, Robert Pigot, vice Whitmore

Master and Worker.

Hon. William Chetwynd

June 3, 1769, Charles Sloan (now Lord) Cadogan, vice Hon.

Wm. Chetwynd

Comptroller.

John Buller, esq.

Surveyor of the Meltings, &c.

Geo. A. Selwyn

POST - MASTER GENERAL.

Joint Post-Masters.

Earl of Besborough, Hon. Robert Hamden (now
 Lord Trevor)

Nov. 27, 1762, Earl of Egmont, vice Earl of Besborough

Sept. 10, 1763, Lord Hyde, vice Earl of Egmont

July 20, 1765, Earl of Besborough, vice Lord Hyde

July 20, 1765, Lord Grantham (late) vice Lord Trevor

Oct. 27, 1766, Earl of Hillsborough, Lord Le Despenser

Jan. 20, 1768, Earl of Sandwich, vice Earl of Hillsborough

Oct. 19, 1770, Hon. Hen. Fred. Thynne Carteret, vice Earl
 of Sandwich

Lord Le Despenser

SECRETARY AT WAR.

Right Hon. Lord Barrington

Mar. 24, 1761, Right Hon. Charles Townshend (late)

Feb. 27, 1763, Right Hon. Welbore Ellis

July 20, 1765, Lord Barrington

1778, Charles Jenkinson, esq.

A D M I R A L T Y.

First Lord.

Lord Anson

June 19, 1762, Lord Halifax

Oct. 16, 1762, George Grenville
 April 16, 1763, Lord Sandwich
 Sept. 9, 1763, Lord Egmont
 Sept. 16, 1766, Sir Charles Saunders
 Dec. 2, 1766, Sir Edward Hawke
 Jan. 12, 1771, Lord Sandwich

Lords of the Admiralty.

Admiral Boscawen, Dr. Hay, Thomas Orby Hunter, Gilbert
 (now Sir Gilbert) Elliot, Admiral Forbes, Hans Stanley
 Mar. 21, 1761, Lord Villiers, vice Admiral Boscawen
 Thomas Pelham, vice Gilbert Elliot
 Jan. 1, 1762, Lord Carysfort, vice Lord Villiers
 James Harris, vice Thomas Pelham
 April 16, 1763, Lord Howe, vice T. O. Hunter
 Lord Digby, vice James Harris
 Hon. Thomas Pitt, vice Admiral Forbes
 July 2, 1765, Sir Charles Saunders, vice Lord Carysfort
 Admiral Keppel, vice Dr. Hay
 C. Townshend, vice Lord Howe
 Sir William Meredith, vice Lord Digby
 John Buller, vice Hans Stanley
 Dec. 1765, Hon. John Yorke, vice Hon. Tho. Pitt
 Sept. 16, 1766, Sir George Yonge, vice Sir C. Saunders
 made first Lord
 Lord Palmerston, vice Hon. John Yorke
 Dec. 2, 1766, Sir Piercy Brett, vice Admiral Keppel
 Charles Jenkinson, vice Sir W. Meredith
 Mar. 19, 1768, Lord Charles Spencer, vice C. Jenkinson
 Feb. 1770, Admiral Holbourne, vice Sir G. Yonge
 Feb. 1770, Charles James Fox, vice Sir Piercy Brett
 Lord Lisburne, vice Charles Townshend
 Jan. 26, 1771, Aug. John Hervey, vice Admiral Holbourne
 May 6, 1772, Thomas Bradshaw, vice Cha. J. Fox
 Dec. 23, 1774, Henry Penton, vice Tho. Bradshaw, deceased
 April 1775, Sir Hugh Palliser, bart. vice Aug. John Hervey,
 vey, called to the House of Peers on the
 death of his brother the Earl of Bristol
 Dec. 1777, Lord Mulgrave, vice Lord Palmerston.
 April 1779, Admiral Mann, vice Sir Hugh Palliser
 July, 1779, Bamber Gascoyne, esq. vice Ld. C. Spencer

Oct. 1780, C. F. Greville, and G. Derby, esqrs. vice
J. Buller and R. Mann, esqrs.

COMMISSIONERS OF THE NAVY.

Treasurer.

Right Hon. Geo. Grenville

June 2, 1762, Lord Barrington

Aug. 9, 1765, Lord Howe

Mar. 19, 1770, Sir Gilbert Elliot, bart. died in 1777

June 1777, Welbore Ellis

Comptroller.

George Cockburne, esq.

July 31, 1770, Sir Hugh Palliser, bart. vice George Cockburne, esq. deceased

April 1775, Maurice Suckling, esq. vice Sir Hugh Palliser, made a Lord of the Admiralty

July 1778, C. Middleton, vice Mr. Suckling, deceased

Joint Surveyors.

Thomas Slade, esq. William Bately, esq.

Oct. 10, 1765, John Williams, esq. vice Wm. Bately, esq. superannuated

Feb. 26, 1771, John Williams (now Sir John) and Edw. Hunt, vice Sir Tho. Slade, deceased.

Clerk of the Acts.

Daniel Devert, esq.

1766, Edmund Mason, esq. D. Devert, esq.

July 1, 1773, G. Marsh, esq. vice E. Mason. esq. deceased

Comptroller of the Treasurer's Accounts.

Richard Hall, esq.

1761, Timothy Brett, esq. vice Richard Hall, esq. deceased

Comptroller of the Victualling Accounts.

Robert Osborn, esq.

June 26, 1771, Charles Proby, esq. vice Robert Osborn, esq. deceased

Oct. 24, 1771, Thomas Hanway, esq. vice Charles Proby, esq. removed to Chatham

Oct. 8, 1772, G. Marsh, esq. vice T. Hanway, esq. deceased

1773, James Gambier, esq. vice George Marsh, esq.

Clerk of the Acts

1773, William Palmer, esq. vice James Gambier, esq. removed to Portsmouth

Comp.

Comptroller of the Store-keeper's Accounts.

George Adams, esq.

[signed

1761, Hon. Wm. Bateman, vice Geo. Adams, re-

Extra Commissioners.

Hon. Wm. Bateman. None appointed in his room

Digby Dent, esq.

Timothy Brett, esq.

1761, Sir Richard Temple, bart. vice Tim. Brett, esq.

Comptroller of the Treasurer's Accounts

1762, Sir John Bentley, vice Digby Dent, esq. deceased.

This appointment discontinued, on Sir John's promotion to a flag, and only one extra commissioner, until

May, 1779, Sir R. Temple, bart. and Edward Le Cras, esq.

They had last year but 500l. each, but now they are raised to 800l.

AT THE PORTS.

Chatham.

Thomas Cooper, esq.

1765, Thomas Hanway, esq. vice Thomas Cooper, esq. superannuated

Oct. 24, 1771, Charles Proby, esq. vice Thomas Hanway, esq. appointed Comptroller of the Victualling Accounts.

Portsmouth.

Richard Hughes, esq. (now Sir Rich. Hughes, bart.)

1773, James Gambier, esq. vice Sir Richard Hughes, bart. superannuated

1778, SiSam. Hood, vice J. Gambier

Plymouth.

Fred. Rogers, esq. (now Sir F. Rogers, bart.)

Feb. 1775, Paul Henry Ourry, esq. vice Sir Fred. Rogers, bart. superannuated

Gibraltar.

Oct. 1763, Charles Colby, esq. superannuated, and none appointed in his room, until

June, 1779, J. A. Pownall, is said to be *Naval Officer* of Gibraltar, with an Appointment of 200l. a year.

Halifax.

April 1775, Marriot Arbuthnot, esq.

NAVAL DEPARTMENT.

Vice-Admiral of Great Britain.

Lord Anson.

Jan

Jan. 4, 1763, Henry Osborne, vice Lord Anson, deceased
 Nov. 5, 1765, Sir E. Hawke, vice Henry Osborne, resigned
Rear-Admiral of Great Britain.

Sir William Rowley

Jan. 4, 1763, Sir Edward Hawke, vice Sir Wm. Rowley
 Nov. 5, 1765, Sir Charles Knowles, vice Sir E. Hawke
 Oct. 1770, Sir Francis Holburne, vice Sir Charles Knowles
 Aug. 17, 1771, Sir George Bridges Rodney, vice Sir Fra.
 Holburne

Vice-Admiral of Scotland.

Earl Finlater

Dec. 22, 1764, John Earl of Hyndford, vice Lord Finlater
 Nov. 5, 1765, Earl of March, vice Earl of Hyndford
 1776, Earl of Breadalbane, vice Lord March
Master of Greenwich Hospital.

Admiral Isaac Townshend

Nov. 30, 1765, Sir George Bridges Rodney, vice Admiral
 Townshend

June 15, 1771, Sir Francis Holburne, vice Sir George
 Bridges Rodney

Aug. 17, 1771, Sir Charles Hardy, vice Sir Francis Holburne
 deceased

Sept. 1780, Sir Hugh Palliser, vice Sir C. Hardy, de-
 ceased

BOARD OF ORDNANCE.

Master General.

Lord Ligonier

May 14, 1763, Marquis of Granby, vice Earl of Ligonier

Oct. 18, 1770, Marquis of Granby died, and no Master-
 General was appointed till [Granby

Oct. 17, 1772, Lord Visc. Townshend, vice Marquis of
Lieutenant General.

Marquis of Granby

May 14, 1763, Lord Visc. Townshend, vice Marquis of
 Granby

Oct. 24, 1767, Right Hon. Henry Seymour Conway, vice
 Geo. Visc. Townshend

Oct. 22, 1772, Sir Jeffery Amherst, now Lord Amherst,
 vice H. S. Conway

Surveyor.

Charles (now Sir) Frederick

Clerk

Clerk of the Ordnance.

William Rawlinson Earle, esq.

Dec. 18, 1772, Sir Charles Cocks Bart. vice Wm. Rawlinson Earle, who resigned

Storekeeper.

Andrew Wilkinson, esq.

Dec. 1762, Sir Edw. Winnington, vice And. Wilkinson

Sept. 7, 1765, And. Wilkinson, esq. vice Sir Edw. Winnington

July 1778. Benj. Langlois, esq. vice Mr. Wilkinson

Oct. 1780, Henry Strachey, esq. vice Mr. Langlois.

Clerk of the Deliveries.

Charles (now Sir) Cocks

Dec. 18, 1772, Benj. L'Anglois, esq. vice Sir Charles Cocks

July 1775. Henry Strachey esq. vice Mr. L'Anglois

Oct. 1780, John Kenrick, esq. vice Mr. Strachey.

Treasurer.

Francis Gashry, esq.

June 1, 1762, Charles Jenkinson, esq. vice Francis Gashry

May 14, 1763, John Ross Mackye, esq. vice Charles Jenkinson

Oct. 1780, William Adam, esq. vice Mr. Mackye.

GOVERNORS OF FORTS, &c.

IN GREAT-BRITAIN.

Fort Augustus and Fort George, near Inverness, Sir Ch. Howard, died in Sept. 1765, and was succeeded by Gen. Studholme Hodgson

Berwick and Holy Island, Gen. John Guise, died in June 1765, and was succeeded by Gen. Monckton, who was succeeded by Sir John Mordaunt

Blackness, Hon. Charles Hope Weir, who was succeeded by the Duke of Hamilton

Carlisle, Gen. Stanwix, lost in his passage to Ireland, and was succeeded by the Earl of Darlington

Chester, Earl Cholmondeley, died June 10, 1770, and was succeeded by his brother, Gen. Cholmondeley, who dying in 1775, was succeeded by Charles Rainford, esq.

Cinque Ports, Duke of Dorset, died Oct. 9, 1765, and succeeded by the Earl of Holderness died in 1778, and succeeded by Lord North

Dar

Portsmouth, Arthur Holdsworth

Wambarton, Earl of Eglington

Edinburgh, Lieut. Gen. Humphry Bland.—At present, Earl of Loudoun

Gravesend, Lord Cadogan, who was succeeded by William Faucitt, esq.

Warrmsley, Lord Delawar, died March 14, 1766, and was succeeded by Sir Rich. Lyttelton, who died Oct. 1, 1770,

and was succeeded by Sir Jeffery (now Lord) Amherst

Full, Gen. Pulteney, resigned in July, 1766, and was succeeded by Gen. Honeywood

Warrmsley, Sir Henry Bellenden; at present, Robert Sloper, esq.

Warrmsley, Gen. Huske, who died in Jan. 1761, and was succeeded by the Earl of Albemarle, who died Oct. 13, 1772,

and was succeeded by Gen. Conway

Warrmsley, Lord George Beauclerk, died in May, 1768; then Gen. Armiger, and, March 19, 1770, Gen. Clavering;

after him, the Hon. Alex. Mackay

Warrmsley, Col. Arth. Owen, died in 1774, and was succeeded

by Col. Beauclerk, who died 1775, and was succeeded

by M. Gen. Robinson

Warrmsley, Gen. Waldegrave, (now Earl)

Warrmsley, Lord Tyrawley, died July, 1773, and was suc-

ceeded by Gen. Harvey, who died in 1778, and was suc-

ceeded by Gen. Monckton.

Warrmsley, Earl of Godolphin, died Jan. 17, 1766

Warrmsley, Sir John Mordaunt; at present Lt. Gen. Craig

Warrmsley, Earl of Loudoun.—At present, Sir James Campbell, bart.

Warrmsley, Sir Andrew Agnew, died Aug. 14, 1771, and

was succeeded by the Hon. Maj. Gen. Alex. Mackay; at

present, Lord Adam Gordon

Warrmsley, Col. Deane, died in 1775, and succeeded by Lieut.

Col. James Murray; at present, W. Browne, esq.

Warrmsley, Earl of Portsmouth; then Lord Holmes;

then Hans Stanley; Dec. 23, 1766, Duke of Bolton; and

in 1770, Hans Stanley, who in 1774 had a grant of it for

life, died Jan. 1780, now Sir Rich. Worsley, Bart.

Warrmsley, Gen. Kingsley, died in Nov. 1769, and was

succeeded by Gen. Burgoyne, who resigned in October,

1779, and was succeeded by Major General Vaughan.

Wind-

Windsor, Earl of Cardigan, (now Duke of Montagu)
Chelsea Hospital, Sir Robert Rich, died Feb. 1, 1768, and
 was succeeded by Gen. Mostyn, who was succeeded
 Gen. (now Sir Geo.) Howard, K. B.

LIEUTENANTS, &c. IN ENGLAND.

Bedford, Duke of Bedford. Succeeded at his death, in J
 1771, by the Earl of Upper Offory

Berks, Duke of St. Albans. Succeeded, , 176 ,
 by Lord Vere; and in July 19, 1771, Duke of St. Alba
 was again appointed

Bucks, Earl Temple. Succeeded, May 9, 1763, by Le
 Le Despencer

Cambridge, Viscount Royston, now Earl of Hardwicke

Chester, Earl Cholmondeley. Died June 10, 1770, and w
 succeeded by his grandson, the present Earl Cholmonde

Cornwall, Lord Edgcombe

Cumberland, Earl of Egremont, Cust. Rot. Died Aug. 2
 1763, and was succeeded by Sir James Lowther, fir
 appointed Ld. Lieut.

Derby, Duke of Devonshire. Feb. 21, 1763, Marquis
 Granby appointed in his room; and June 17, 1766, L
 George Cavendish

Devon, Duke of Bedford. Succeeded at his death, in J
 1771, by Earl Powlett

Dorset, Earl of Shaftesbury. Died April 21, 1771, a
 was succeeded, June 7, following, by Lord Digby

Durham, Bishop of Durham, Cust. Rot. Earl of Darli
 ton, Lord Lieut.

Essex, Earl of Rochford

Gloucester, Lord Chedworth. Succeeded in 1763, by Ne
 Berkeley, esq. afterwards Lord Botetourt, and on July
 1766, the Earl of Berkeley was appointed

Hereford, Viscount Bateman

Hrtford, Earl Cowper. Died Sept. 18, 1764; Oct.
 1764, Earl of Essex was appointed; and Mar. 1, 17
 Viscount Cranburn, now Earl of Salisbury, vice the E
 of Essex

Huntingdon, Duke of Manchester, who died May 10, 17
 and was succeeded by the present Duke of Manchester.

Kent, Duke of Dorset. Died Feb. 9, 1769. The pre
 Duke of Dorset is now Lord Lieut.

Lancaster, Lord Strange. Died June 1, 1771, and was succeeded, July 19 following, by the Earl of Derby.

Leicester, Duke of Rutland

Lincoln, Duke of Ancaster; died in 1778, and succeeded, by the present Duke

Middlesex, Duke of Newcastle. Succeeded, 1763, by the Earl (now Duke) of Northumberland

Monmouth, T. Morgan, esq. At present, the Duke of Beaufort

Norfolk, Earl of Orford

Northampton, Earl of Halifax. Died June 8, 1771, and

on July 19, 1771, Earl of Northampton appointed

Northumberland, Earl of Northumberland, (now Duke)

Nottingham, Duke of Newcastle. Succeeded, Jan. 10, 1763,

by the late Duke of Kingston; Sept. 7, 1765, late Duke

of Newcastle; and on Dec. 16, 1768, the present Duke

of Newcastle appointed

Stafford, Duke of Marlborough

Staland, Earl of Exeter; at present, the Earl of Winchelsea.

Salep, Earl Powis. Succeeded 176, by the Earl of Bath,

who died July 8, 1764, and was succeeded, Aug. 17,

1764, by Earl Powis, who died in 1772, and was succe-

ded, Oct. 9, 1772, by Lord Clive who died in 1774,

and was succeeded in 1775 by his son, Lord Clive

Somerset, Earl Powlett. Died Nov. 3, 1764, and Nov. 30,

1764, Earl of Thomond appointed, who died in 1774,

and was succeeded by Lord North

Southampton, Duke of Bolton. Died 1765, and was succe-

ded by the Marquis of Caernarvon; and on Aug. 21, 1764,

the Earl of Northington was appointed; and on Jan. 23,

1771, the Marquis of Caernarvon (now Duke of Chandos)

was again appointed

Stafford, Earl Gower

Stafford, Duke of Grafton. Succeeded, Feb. 8, 1763, by

Lord Maynard; and on June 3, 1769, Duke of Grafton

again appointed

Surrey, Lord Onslow, died in 1776, George Lord Onslow

Suffex, Duke of Richmond, appointed Oct. 18, 1763

Warwick, Earl of Hertford

Westmoreland, Sir James Lowther

Wilt, Earl of Pembroke

Worcester, Earl of Coventry

Worth, West Riding, Marquis of Rockingham. Succee-

ded in 1762 by the Earl of Huntingdon; and on Aug.

17, 1765, the Marq. of Rockingham was again appointed
Ditto, North Riding, Earl of Holderness, Lord Lieut Mar-
 quis of Rockingham, Cust. Rot. re-appointed Aug. 1
 1765; at present, Earl Fauconberg, lord lieutenant, vi
 Earl of Holderness

Ditto, East Riding. Earl of Holderness, died in 177
 Marquis of Carmarthen appointed

Tower Hamlets, Earl Cornwallis, who died in 1762. Succe
 ded by the late Lord Berkeley of Stratton, and on De
 8, 1770, the present Earl Cornwallis was appointed

OFFICERS OF STATE IN SCOTLAND.

Lord Justice General.

Marquis of Tweeddale (late)

Apr. 16, 1763, Duke of Queensbury, vice Marquis
 Tweeddale, deceased

In 1778 the Duke of Queensbury died, and Lord Sto
 mont was appointed.

Keeper of the Great Seal.

Archibald, (late) Duke of Argyll

May, 1761, Duke of Queensbury

April 16, 1763, James, Duke of Athol, vice Duke
 Queensbury

Jan. 28, 1764, Earl of Marchmont, vice Duke of Ath
 deceased

Lord Privy Seal.

James (late) Duke of Athol

Apr. 16, 1763, Rt. Hon. J. S. Mackenzie, vice Duke of Ath

Apr. 30, 1765, Ld. F. Campbell, vice J. Stuart Macken

Nov. 5, 1765, Earl of Breadalbane, vice Ld. Fred. Campb

Aug 30, 1766, Jas. Stuart Mackenzie, vice the Earl
 Breadalbane

Lord Register.

Earl of Morton (late)

1768, Lord Fred. Campbell, vice late Ld. Mort

Lord President of Police.

Earl of Marchmont

Jan. 28, 1764, Lord Cathcart, vice Earl of Marchmo

Sept. 1776, Lord March, (now Duke of Queensbur
 vice Lord Cathcart

Vice Admiral.

Earl Fialater

Dec. 22, 1764, J, Earl of Hyndford, vice the Earl of Finlater
Aug. 30, 1766, James, Earl of March, vice the Earl of
Hyndford

Sept. 1776, Earl of Breadalbane, vice Lord March
Secretary to the Order of the Thistle.

George Drummond, esq.

Apr. 13, 1765, Sir H. Erskine, vice G. Drummond, esq.

Aug. 1765, George Dempster, esq. for life, vice Sir
Harry Erskine

OFFICERS OF STATE IN IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant.

Duke of Bedford

Mar. 20, 1761, Earl of Halifax

Apr. 20, 1763, Duke of Northumberland

Apr. 30, 1765, Viscount Weymouth

Aug. 1, 1765, Earl of Hertford

Sept. 26, 1766, Earl of Bristol

Aug. 12, 1767, Lord Viscount Townshend

Oct. 9, 1772, Earl Harcourt

Dec. 18, 1776, Earl of Buckinghamshire

Oct. 13, 1780, Earl of Carlisle

Clerk of the Pells.

George Dodington (afterwards Lord Melcombe)

1763, Rt. Hon. Henry Fox (afterwards Lord Holland) for
life, and also for the lives of his two sons, Stephen and
Charles James, died in 1774, and succeeded by his eldest
son Stephen, late Lord Holland, who also died in 1774, and
was succeeded by his brother the Hon. Cha. James Fox,
who resigned Oct. 1775, and was succeeded by Charles Jen-
kinson, esq.

Joint Vice Treasurers.

Earl of Sandwich, Rt. Hon. Welbore Ellis, Right Hon.
Robert Nugent (now Lord Clare)

Dec. 1762, Rt. Hon. Rich. Rigby, vice Welbore Ellis

Feb. 19, 1763, Rt. Hon. J. Oswald, vice Earl of Sandwich

July 12, 1765, Rt. Hon. Welbore Ellis, vice Ld. Clare

Dec. 20, 1765, Right Hon. Lord George Sackville (now
Germain) vice Richard Rigby

Aug. 1766, Right Hon. James Grenville, vice Lord
George Sackville

Oct. 1766, Right Hon. Isaac Barré, vice Welb. Ellis

Jan. 20, 1768, Rt. Hon. Richard Rigby, vice James Oswald

June 14, 1768, Lord Clare, vice Rigby

Lord Edgcumbe, vice Isaac Barré

Feb. 2, 1770, Right Hon. Wel. Ellis, vice Jas. Grenville

Dec. 8, 1772, Right Hon. Charles Jenkinson, vice Lord Edgcumbe

Oct. 1775, Right Hon. H. Flood, vice C. Jenkinson

1777, Rt. Hon. Ch. Townshend, vice Welbore Ellis

INDEX OF OFFICES.

<i>Admiralty</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Attorney and Solicitor General</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Bishops</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Board of Works</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Board of Trade</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Chancellor, Lord</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Chamberlain, Lord, his Department</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Chief Justices in Eyre</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Commissioners of the Navy</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Governors of Forts</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Jewel Office</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Ireland</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Lieutenants of Counties</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Master of the Horse</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Mint</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Naval Department</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Ordnance</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Paymaster-General of the Forces</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Postmaster-General</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>President, Lord</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Privy Seal, Lord</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Queen's Household</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Scotland</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Secretaries of State</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Secretary at War</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Steward, Lord, his Department</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Treasury</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Treasurer of the Chamber</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Warden, Lord, of Stanneries</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Wardrobe, Great</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Wales, Prince</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPEN

A P P E N D I X.

Case of the Borough of ABINGDON.—Petitioner, Nathaniel Bayley, Esq.—Sitting Member, John Mayor, Esq.

The case was, that Mr. Mayor at the time of the election was high sheriff for the county of Berks, and he returned himself duly elected, in manifest prejudice of the petitioner, who being the only candidate capable of being elected, was duly chosen, and ought to have been returned. There were two points therefore in this case: 1. Whether the high sheriff of a county may be chosen to serve in parliament for a borough within his county? 2. Whether, if he is not eligible, on such notice as was given in the present case, the votes for him are thrown away, and the other candidate who had a smaller number of legal votes duly elected, or whether it is a void election?

The counsel for the petitioner argued, that by an express clause in the writ of election, the choice of sheriffs is prohibited, and they quoted several eminent authorities, Sir Simon D'Ewes, Mr. Hakewell, Lord Chief Justice Hale, Mr. Justice Blackstone, &c. to move that it had been constantly the law of parliament to prohibit sheriffs from being chosen either for county or borough within the county. The counsel for the sitting member said that the authority of *civil* writ was unquestionable, but it was not so with political writs. They rather testify, and particularly the writs of election, the tyranny of our kings and the arbitrary power they assumed in former periods of the constitution, than afford any evidence of the law. And they shewed that there were many directions in the writ which were not complied with. If the prohibition were strictly to be adhered to, a sheriff for one county could not be chosen knight of the shire for another; but that would not be asserted in the present day; then if they are eligible for any other county, why should they not be for boroughs in their own.

The Committee decided, that neither the sitting member nor the petitioner were duly elected, and that the election was void.

Case of the city and county of the city of BRISTOL.—Petitioners, Mathew Bricklade, Esq. certain freeholders and free burgesses of the city and county of the city of BRISTOL.

Against, Henry Cruger the younger, Esq. and Edmund Burke, Esq. sitting members.

The petitions set forth that the election was holden on the 7th of October, and that at the election the petitioner, Mr. Bricklade, together with Robert Craggs, Lord Viscount Clare, of the kingdom of Ireland, and Henry Cruger the younger, Esq. and no other persons, were candidates; that poll was then demanded for each of the three candidates, proceeded upon and adjourned to the following day; that on the succeeding day, Lord Clare declined proceeding on the poll and that Mr. Bricklade, the petitioner, having that day a majority of votes, ought to have been declared duly elected, and to have been returned; but that Edmund Burke, Esq. was on the same day, the 8th of October, first named a candidate, that the sheriffs afterwards on the 10th of October, and not before, awarded a poll to be taken for Mr. Burke, notwithstanding the protestation of Mr. Bricklade, and many of the electors, to the contrary.

That, in order to influence the election, many persons were admitted to the freedom of the city, after the date and issuing forth of the writ, to poll for Mr. Burke and Mr. Cruger.—That divers persons not legally admitted to this freedom, not having any right to vote, were admitted to poll for Mr. Burke and Mr. Cruger; and that Mr. Burke and Mr. Cruger, by themselves, and their agents and others by their privity and direction, before and during the poll, were guilty of bribery.

From these allegations, it appeared that there were several questions in the case.

1. Whether a person may be elected who becomes a candidate on a day subsequent to that on which the election was appointed to be holden, and on which the poll commenced?

2. Whether persons admitted to the freedom of the city of Bristol after the date and issuing of the writ for the election of members of parliament for that city, have a right to vote at such election?

3. Whether Mr. Burke and Mr. Cruger, or either of them were guilty of bribery?

The committee proceeded to the discussion of the first of these questions, and after hearing the arguments of counsel pro and con. declared Mr. Burke was eligible.

They then proceeded to the remainder of the case. The House had made no determination on the right of election in Bristol.

Bristol; but it seemed to be taken for granted on both sides, that it is "in the freeholders, having freeholds of forty shillings a year, and the free burgesses." To prove that it had been the custom not to admit persons made free after the estate, several witnesses were called, and many arguments stated, which were answered by the counsel for the sitting members; and an attempt was made to support the allegations of bribery: they said that a number of gentlemen paid the fees of admission for the new freemen, with money raised by subscription for that purpose, but neither of the candidates had subscribed or paid any of that money. This charge was answered by an assertion that as there was no proof of bribery brought home to them, no condition had been annexed to the payment of their fees of admission; they were not bound to vote for the sitting members upon that account; it was therefore perfectly innocent on the part of those who had done it; but there had been no proof attempted of any money being paid by the sitting members for admission fees.

The committee declared the two sitting members to be duly elected.

Case of the Borough of BEDFORD.—Petitioners, Samuel Whitbread, Esq. and John Howard, Esq. certain burgesses, freemen and inhabitants, being freeholders of Bedford, and electors for that borough.—Sitting members, Sir William Wake, Bart. and Robert Sparrow, Esq.

The petition of Mr. Whitbread and Mr. Howard contained a charge of bribery against the sitting members; and the other petition alledged, that the mayor, aldermen, and other officers of the borough, had, previous to the election, got a majority of *pretended* electors under their own influence, with a design to render the election subservient to the will of the corporation: that they had corruptly made offers to one or more persons to procure them to be elected members, in consideration of a large sum of money to be paid to them; and that John Cawne, John Rose, and Thomas Howard, the returning officers, had been guilty of corrupt, partial, and illegal practices.

The last determination of the House on the right of election in Bedford is on the 12th April, 1690. The difference between a burgess and a freeman in Bedford is, that all the sons of a burgess are entitled to be burgesses, and only the eldest son of a freeman is entitled to be a freeman. The magistrates are all

all chosen out of the *burgesses*. There were several questions in this case upon the construction of the last determination 1st Point. The counsel for the petitioners contended, that the expression "being householders of Bedford," was to be applied as well to the *burgesses* and freemen as to the *inhabitants*; or, in other words, that non-resident *burgesses* and freemen have no right to vote. After hearing the arguments on both sides, the committee came to a resolution, "that in their opinion the words being householders of Bedford contained in the resolution of the House of Commons, 12 April, 1690, do not refer to the *burgesses* and freemen but to the *inhabitants* only."

2d Point. The petitioners contended, that all the non-resident freemen and *burgesses* were *honorary* and *occasional*. On this the committee declared, "that they were clear in their opinion, that the objection of occasionality did not lie against freemen made above a year before the election. They did not determine on the point of honorary freemen."

The next point was, whether persons having received of charity called Harpur's charity, within a year before the election, were entitled to vote, or whether they were disqualified under the words *receiving alms*. After hearing the arguments of both sides, and referring to the acts and precedents, "the committee were of opinion, that persons receiving Sir William Harpur's charity are not thereby disqualified, within the meaning of the determination of 12 April, 1690, from voting for members of parliament for Bedford."

The next point was, that thirty-six votes should be added to the poll of the petitioners, who had been rejected because they had come into the parishes where they resided in Bedford with certificates from other parishes. This was agreed to. They then proceeded to trace bribery on the sitting members. The counsel for the sitting members objected to the votes of 1. Persons having received Hawes's charity. 2. Persons having received Welborn's charity. 3. The master and brethren of an hospital called St. John's Hospital. 4. Freemen who had received parish relief within the year. And 5. Freemen who had an inchoate right to their freedom, but were admitted in a particular manner, different from the customary mode of admission for such freemen, and within a year before the election. On these heads the committee determined, 1. That

the persons receiving Hawes's charity were not disqualified. 2. That their receiving Welborn's charity were disqualified. 3. That the master and brethren of St. John's Hospital were not disqualified. 4. That the word *alms*, in the resolution of 1690, refers to burgessees and freemen as well as to inhabitants householders of Bedford. And 5. That the six persons who tendered their votes at the last election for Bedford, being admitted within the twelvemonth by the common council, had not a right to vote.

And finally, having corrected the polls by these several resolutions, they determined that Sir William Wake, Bart, one of the sitting members, and Samuel Whitbread, Esq. one of the petitioners, were duly elected.

Case of the Borough of CRICKLADE.—Petitioners, Samuel Peach, Esq. and John Dewar, Esq.

A vacancy having happened in the borough in the month of December after the general election, by the death of Mr. Earle, a new writ was ordered out, and Mr. Dewar and Mr. Peach were both returned by the same indenture. Mr. Dewar's petition set forth, that he had a great majority of legal votes; but that, notwithstanding, the returning officer, Thomas Carter, had returned Mr. Peach along with the petitioner. Mr. Peach in his petition set forth, that on the second day of the election, as the returning officer, the candidates, and electors, were proceeding to the place of polling, a riot commenced, which obliged the returning officer immediately to close the poll, when only forty-one out of near two hundred persons entitled to vote had given their suffrages; and that on that account Mr. Dewar and the petitioner were returned. That the petitioner was by reason thereof prevented from receiving the suffrages of a large majority of the electors—That Mr. Dewar, or his agents, had, by entertainments and feasts daily given at their expence to the electors, endeavoured to procure votes, and had kept the borough in continual riot, tumult, and dissipation.

The returning officer was in the interest of Peach, and he was attended by a barrister retained by Peach, who dictated to him in every instance. The counsel said he was guided entirely by one King, a blacksmith, as to the right of the several voters who presented themselves. It was attempted to be proved, that

that Peach's friends and the returning officer had agreed, that if any disturbance should happen, and Peach be a-head, they would close the poll instantly, and make a single return. On the second day a sort of scuffle happened at the church door between Mr. Herbert, a member of the House of Commons and Mr. Benson, a merchant in London. Benson pushed Herbert from the door as he endeavoured to enter, on which Herbert collared him. The scuffle continuing, several of Peach's friends cried out, "a riot! a riot!" On this the counsel for the returning officer directed him to close the poll which he did, and they left the church together, although earnestly entreated by Dewar and his friends to remain. The witnesses for Mr. Dewar swore, that there was not any thing like a riot or disturbance, sufficient to terrify any reasonable man. When the poll was closed, Mr. Herbert went to the returning officer, and intreated him to renew it, promising to give any security he should require, that he would not molest Benson, nor occasion any disturbance; and desiring, if it were thought necessary, that both Benson and he might be committed till the election should be over. But the returning officer and his counsel absolutely refused to open the poll again. On this, the electors in the interest of Mr. Dewar went and gave their voices for him before a constable; Mr. Peach's friends being apprized of this poll, but none of them came.

After hearing the arguments of the counsel, the committee, after long deliberation, resolved that the constable's poll should not be given in evidence, nor parole evidence be admitted to prove what persons polled before the constable. And finally, they determined, that neither Mr. Peach, nor Mr. Dewar were duly returned, and that the election for the borough of Cricklade was a void election.

Second Case of the Borough of CRICKLADE.—Petitioners, Six persons on the behalf of themselves and others, electors of the said borough.—Fourteen persons on behalf of themselves and others, electors of the said borough.—Sitting member, Samuel Peach, Esq.

The petitions stated, that the returning officers had acted with the grossest partiality. The six electors complained, that they and many others, duly qualified, offered to give their votes for John Dewar, Esq. but were rejected by the returning

returning officer—both the petitions stated that many votes were partially admitted for Mr. Peach, which stood precisely in the same predicament with many, which he rejected, when offered for Mr. Dewar; and that he admitted many for Mr. Peach who had no right to vote. There is no determination of the house, on the right of election in this borough, but the following entry stands, “22 Feb. 1695-6, Colonel Granville reports from the committee of privileges and elections, that it was *agreed*, that the right of election for Cricklade, was in the freeholders, copyholders, and leaseholders, for not less than three years.” The counsel for the petitioners contended, that the boundaries of the borough extended beyond the line adopted on the part of the sitting member, and that seven houses for which votes had been tendered in favour of Dewar, and rejected on the ground of their being without, are within the boundaries. On the other side again it was urged, that the true limits of the borough excluded these seven houses. Particular evidence was gone into to ascertain the boundaries. The next part urged by the counsel for the petitioners was, that it was not necessary that the houses for which votes were claimed, should either be ancient houses, or built on ancient scites, but that a sufficient estate in any house within the borough gave a right to vote. This was denied by the other side—they said, that only ancient houses, or houses build on ancient scites, gave a right to vote. Many witnesses were called, who proved that they had never before this election heard a distinction made between new and old houses. The third point urged by the counsel for the petitioners was, “that leaseholders for a term of three years or more, determinable on a life or lives, and persons having a lease for that or a longer time granted by lessors, who have themselves leases for three or more years, but determinable on a life or lives, have a right to vote.” This was admitted by the counsel for the sitting member, after having heard the evidence. It was then contended, that residence of 40 days before the election was necessary to give a person a title to vote. Witnesses were called to prove, that this was understood to be the usage. After this, they entered into evidence to prove the gross partiality of the returning officer, and to bring home a charge of bribery on the sitting member. After hearing the arguments on both sides, the committee came to the

the following resolution: Resolved, "That it is the opinion of this committee, that the right of voting for members to serve in parliament, for the borough of Cricklade, in the county of Wilts, is, in the inhabitants possessing houses with in the said borough, who are freeholders, copyholders, or leaseholders, for any term not less than three years, or for any such term, or greater term, determinable on a life or lives; such freeholder, copyholder, or leaseholder, having been in the occupation of the house, for which he may claim to vote, forty days preceeding any election."

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this committee, that the seven houses above-mentioned are within the boundary of the said borough.

By these resolutions, all the points of the petitioners were granted, and a majority was established for Mr. Dewar.—The counsel for the sitting member said, they would give the committee no farther trouble. They then determined that John Dewar, Esq. was duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

Case of the Borough of DORCHESTER.—Petitioners, Anthony Chapman, Esq. several inhabitants and electors of the borough of Dorchester.—Sitting Members, William Ewar, Esq. and John Damer, Esq.

The petitions set forth, in general, that the petitioner had a majority of legal votes, and ought to have been returned and alledged specially—that divers persons were admitted to vote, who were neither "inhabitants, nor occupiers of real estates within the borough," and had no right. The last determination of the right of election in the borough was 18th May, 1720. "Resolved, That the right of electing burgesses to serve in parliament for the borough of Dorchester in the county of Dorset, is in the *inhabitants* of the said borough, paying to church and poor in respect of their personal estates; and in *such persons* as pay to church and poor in respect of their real estates within the said borough."

The counsel for the petitioners contended, that the last clause for the determination means only, "such as are occupiers of real estates within the borough; and in respect thereof, pay to church and poor."—The counsel for the sitting members contended, that it means "*owners* of real estates within

the borough, paying in respect thereof to church and poor, whether such real estates are in their own *occupation* or not."—The usage since 1720 was admitted to be in favour of out-voters.—The counsel for the petitioners contended, that the poor-rate, and church-rate, is a tax upon inhabitants or occupiers only, and not upon landlords, and the votes in Dorchester have always been intitled, "Rates on the several *occupiers* of lands, houses, &c." In 1772, an attempt was made to alter the words in the title, and to make it run, "Rates on the several *owners* or occupiers, &c." but these words were rescinded at the vestry holden for the purpose, and the customary title restored.—On the other side it was contended, that the resolution in 1720 did not mention persons *rated or rateable*, but persons *paying* to church and poor. In Dorchester, as in most other places, the established usage is, that the owner pays the poor-rate; and when there is reason to apprehend the occupier to be in danger of becoming chargeable to the parish, they frequently rate the owner.—It was the same also with respect to the church-rate, for the purpose of supporting or repairing the edifice. Dorchester, they said, was a borough by prescription, and the determination of 1720 must be considered as a declaration of the prescriptive right of election. It ought not, therefore, to be instructed with any reference to the statute of Queen Elizabeth.

The counsel having closed their arguments on the meaning of the last determination, the committee came to the following resolution:—Resolved, "That it is the opinion of this committee that, pursuant to the last determination of the House of Commons, such persons as pay to the church and poor, in respect of their real estates within the borough of Dorchester, in the county of Dorset, though not inhabitants or occupiers, were intitled to vote at the last election of burgesses to serve in parliament for the said borough." The committee then decided, that the two sitting members were duly elected.

Case of the Borough of DERBY.—Petitioners, Daniel Parker Coke, Esq. several electors of Derby.—Sitting Member, John Gisborne, Esq.

Mr. Coke, in his petition, set forth, that he was elected by a great majority of legal voters, but that the Mayor, by rejecting

jecting the votes of many persons who had an undoubted right to poll, and who tendered their votes for him, and by admitting for Mr. Gisborne the votes of divers persons who had no right, the sitting member was returned. The other petition set forth, that the petitioners and divers others, having a lawful and undoubted right to the freedom of the said borough, had claimed to be admitted previous to the election and were, by the mayor and divers aldermen refused, although several persons under the like circumstances had been admitted. There is no determination of the right of election in Derby, by the House of Commons; but the council of both sides agreed, that every member of the corporation has right to vote. The numbers on the poll were,

For Mr. Gisborne ——— 343

For Mr. Coke ——— 329

Majority, 14

but the counsel for the petitioner proposed to add 42 to the poll of Mr. Coke, &c. 26, who being entitled to their freedom, had demanded admission before the election, and having been refused, had tendered their votes at the poll, in favour of Mr. Coke; 12 under the same circumstances, but who had demanded to be admitted on different occasions.

Four who had their freedom, but whose votes were rejected by the Mayor. They also proposed to strike off from the poll in the sitting members 5 who lived in Derby Hospital—3 for having received parish relief—3 honorables admitted within the year—3 who had been admitted burghesses under the title of servitude, without having served seven years apprenticeship—2 who were never admitted their freedom.—But it was only necessary for the committee hear evidence and decide concerning the votes of the 26, who claiming by antecedent titles, had demanded admission to the freedom, and having been refused, had tendered their votes for Mr. Coke. The dispute was about the mode of admission—their pretensions were agreed to.—The counsel for the petitioners argued, that by the express provision of the charter the persons appointed to admit freemen, are the mayor and three aldermen. On the part of Mr. Gisborne, it was denied that this was the legal mode of admission. The clause in the charter did not sanctify such a mode, and the committee

this
have
the
excl
was
adm
thori
but,
some
tition
perio
admi
for th
they
at tha
applie
minis
admit
the m
knowi
intitle
adequa
enquir
counse
que tio
poll. "
his cou
the pet
have b
Case of
Hale
the b
Esq.
The
vote at
no right
in favou
although
majority of
There

this point resolved, "that the clauses in the charter, which have been produced to the committee, have not so established the mode of admission of the freemen of this borough as to exclude other evidence." When this long course of evidence was gone into, to prove, in the first place, that it was usual to admit the burgesses at a common hall, and this usage was authorized by a bye-law, made on the 10th of December, 1743; but, in the year 1772, the charter having been examined by some lawyers, he construed the clause mentioned by the petitioners to mean what they had stated it, and from that period, till about the time of the election, freemen had been admitted by the mayor and aldermen. Upon this the counsel for the petitioners argued, that if the constitution was not as they had apprehended, still, as it was universally understood at that time to be the constitution of the borough, having applied to those who were at least the proper persons to administer the preliminary oaths—having been promised their admissions—put off from time to time—and at last refused by the mayor, with a view to deprive them of their votes, (he knowing them to be in the interest of Mr. Coke)—they were intitled to be put upon the poll. Of these assertions very adequate proof was brought, and their pretensions were also enquired into. On which, after hearing the arguments of counsel, the committee resolved, "that all the 27 voters in question, except William Sale, ought to be added to the poll."—and, after this, the sitting member having said, by his counsel, he would give the committee no farther trouble, the petitioner was declared to be duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

Case of the Borough of DOWNTON.—Petitioners, Sir Philip Hales, Bart. and John Cooper, Esq. certain freeholders of the borough of DOWNTON.—Against, Thomas Duncombe, Esq. and Thomas Dummer, Esq. sitting members.

The petition set forth, that several persons were allowed to vote at the late election of burgesses for this place, who had no right, by which means a pretended majority was procured in favour of the sitting members, and they were returned, although the petitioners, Hales and Cooper, had a clear majority of legal votes.

There is no determination of the House of the right of election

election of this borough. Both sides considered it to be "persons having a freehold interest in burgage tenements, holden by a certain rent, fealty, and suit of court, of the Bishop of Winchester, who is lord of the borough, and paying release of descent, and fines on alienation."

The numbers on the poll were

For Mr. Duncombe	22
Mr. Dummer	22
Mr. Cooper	11
Sir Philip Hales	10

The counsel for the petitioners objected to nineteen or twenty of the voters for the sitting members; one general objection which applied to most of them was occasionality. Mr. Duncombe was proprietor of near two thirds of the burgage tenements in Downton—It was proved that in 1768 he had made conveyances to some of the voters; but the deeds had remained ever since in his hands; the occupiers had continued to pay their rents to him, and still considered him as their landlord. There were no entries on the court-rolls of 1768 of those conveyances, nor of the payment of the alienation fines. The conveyances to others appeared to have been made after the writ and precept had issued, some of them being brought wet to the poll. The grantees did not know where the land lay, and one man produced at the poll a grant for which he claimed a vote, which, on examination, appeared to be made to another person; the consideration in them all was five shillings; the rent twenty shillings a year; they were by lease and release, for life, with a clause of re-entry, if the grantee should assign without the consent of the granter. These kind of votes were called *faggots*. The petitioners contended, that the votes in question were colourable, fraudulent and void, both by the common law of parliament, and the statute of William III. commonly called the *Splitting Act*. Beside the general objection of occasionality, fourteen of the votes for the sitting members were impeached, for reasons drawn from the nature of burgage tenements; they defined a burgage to be "an undivided and indivisible tenement, clearly described, neither created nor capable of being created, within time of memory which has immemorially given a right of voting." It was shewn that by the pipe-roll of 1458, the amount of all the burgages, half-burgages, and quarter-burgages in the borough

is stated to be 126 and three quarters, amounting to 6l. 6s. 2d. the rent for the whole of a burgage is one shilling, for half a burgage sixpence, and for a quarter of a burgage three-pence; a quarter of a burgage, and a half of a burgage are technical terms, and not expressive of the fourth parts or the halves of whole burgages, but of distinct and separate tenements of various extent, and apparently so called, because the quit-rents they pay to the Lord are halves or quarters of what whole burgages pay; they proved that these fourteen votes were not antient quarters of burgages carrying immemorially a right of voting, but for quarters of burgages attempted to be carved out of longer tenements.

After hearing the arguments of Counsel on both sides, resolved, That Thomas Duncombe, Esq. and Thomas Dummer, Esq. were not duly elected; and that Sir Philip Hales, Bart. and John Cooper, Esq. ought to have been returned the burgesses for the borough.

Case of the Borough of HASLEMERE.—Petitioners, William Burke, Esq. and Henry Kelly, Esq. certain inhabitants, freeholders and legal voters of the borough of HASLEMERE.—Sitting members, Thomas More Molyneux, Esq. Sir Meyrick Burrell, Bart.

The first petition stated, that the two sitting members had been guilty of undue and illegal practices—that votes had been admitted, though not legal, for the sitting members; and that the majority of legal votes were in favour of the petitioners. The other petition stated, that Haslemere is a borough by prescription, and that of late years, the practice of splitting and dividing freeholds within the said borough, for election purposes, hath prevailed to so great a degree, that if the same is not remedied, the constitution of the said borough would be subverted. It stated many illegal instances of voting in favour of the sitting members.

The last determination of the House of the right of election was on May 20, 1661. This was explained by a resolution of the House on the 24th April 1755.

The counsel for the petitioners objected to 47 out of 61 of the voters for the sitting members. To 35 as voting for tenements split within the meaning of the statute of K. William. Six as claiming their right from freeholds without the manor.

One his property being leasehold. Two as having no interest but a rent reserved as a term. Three as not having freeholds.

A variety of evidence and argument was gone into on these heads, but as the committee did not come to separate resolutions on the several questions, we cannot state what the point was on which the division turned. They declared the two sitting members to be duly elected.

Case of the Borough of HINDON.—Petitioners, *James Calthorpe, Esq. and Richard Beckford, Esq. against Richard Smith, Esq. and Thomas Brand Hollis, Esq. sitting members.*

The petition set forth, that the two sitting members had by the bribery of themselves and agents, previous to and during the election, procured themselves to be returned, although the petitioners were duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

The last determination of the house on the right of election in this borough was on the 12th April, 1728. After hearing the evidence, the committee determined, that neither the sitting members nor the petitioners had been duly elected, and that the election was void. At the same time, the chairman acquainted the house, that it appeared to the committee that the most flagrant and notorious acts of bribery and corruption had been practised; and that a very considerable majority of the electors of the borough of Hindon had been bribed and corrupted in a very gross and extraordinary manner; and that several others of the said electors had been concerned as agents for that purpose. In consequence of this the committee had resolved, "That it appeared to them that Richard Smith, Esq. by his agents, has been guilty of notorious bribery, in endeavouring to procure himself to be elected and returned a Burgess, to serve in this present parliament, for the borough of Hindon, in the county of Wilts."

Similar resolutions passed respecting Mr. Hollis, Mr. Calthorpe, and Mr. Beckford.

They also resolved, that the Rev. John Nairne, of Hindon Fasham Nairne, Esq. of Bury-street, St. James's, &c. (i.e. all thirteen specified by name) had acted as agents; and had been accessory to, and concerned in, the notorious acts of bribery and corruption that have been practised at the late election for the said borough of Hindon.

They

They also came to a resolution, that it was the opinion of the committee, that the house should be moved for leave to bring in a bill to disfranchise the said borough of Hindon, in the county of Wilts.

The house was accordingly moved, and the previous question being put, it passed in the negative. It was then ordered, that leave be given to bring in a bill to incapacitate from voting at elections of members of parliament 190 persons, specified by name, out of 210 who had polled at the election. This bill was brought into the house, and after having passed through several stages, it was found, when referred to a committee of the whole house, that the bribery and corruption could not be proved, as the persons who had proved it before the select committee were named in the bill, and incapacitated by it; and being parties could not, without overturning the known rules of law, be received as witnesses. This objection was treated as of no weight by the gentlemen of the long robe; but it was strenuously supported by others, and the bill was thrown out.

Leave was then given to bring in a new bill, similar to the former, in which the names of certain persons were left out, who were intended to be made use of as witnesses. Many difficulties were also in the way of this bill. Two witnesses were committed to prison for prevarication; and two disobeyed the order for their attendance, and kept themselves concealed, on which a proclamation was made for apprehending them, with the offer of a reward, and the house was obliged to postpone the further consideration of it for that session; but the house resolved to take the report of the committee into further consideration as early as possible in the next session; and that until then no new writ should be ordered. At the same time they resolved, "That if it shall appear that any person hath procured himself to be elected, or returned a member of this house, or endeavoured so to be by bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this house will proceed with the utmost severity against such person."

An order was also made, "That the attorney-general do forthwith prosecute Richard Smith, Esq. Thomas Brand Hollis, Esq. James Calthorpe, Esq. and Richard Beckford, Esq. for the said offence.

The two persons against whom the proclamation was issued, having surrendered themselves, they were committed to Newgate.

Case of the Borough of HELLESTON, in the county of Cornwall.—Petitioners, Philip Yorke, Esq. and Francis Cuthbert Esq. Richard Johns, jun. alderman, and Mathew Williams Esq. Richard Johns, Edmund Johns, Richard Penhall, and William Rogers, freemen of Helleston.—Sitting member the Right Hon. Francis Godolphin Osborne, commonly called the Marquis of Carmarthen, and Francis Owen, Esq.

Helleston is a borough by prescription, and also by a charter of the 27th of Queen Elizabeth, confirmed by another of the 16th of Charles I. By those charters the corporation was to consist of a mayor, four aldermen, and an indefinite number of freemen. The freemen were to be selected out of the inhabitants, by the mayor, aldermen, and commonalty, or the major part of them: the aldermen by the mayor and aldermen out of the freemen; the mayor by the freemen out of two aldermen, to be nominated by the mayor and aldermen. The right of election of burgesses has constantly been in the mayor and commonalty, which has always been understood to mean the mayor, aldermen, and freemen only. There is no determination upon the right of election, but it has always been admitted to be as just stated. In the year 1769, two informations, in the nature of *quo warranto*, were exhibited in the Court of King's-Bench, against several persons of the borough to shew by what authority they claimed to be freemen, having been elected without the concurrence of the commonalty. Soon after the charter of Queen Elizabeth, a bye-law had been made by the corporation, by which the right of electing freemen was restrained to the mayor and aldermen. After various trials, the Court of King's-Bench, and the House of Lords, delivered their opinion, "That the election of freemen could not be exercised by the mayor and aldermen, exclusive of the commonalty." By these and other prosecutions of the same sort, judgment of ouster was obtained against all the members of the corporation, except two aldermen and eight freemen. In 1772 a petition was presented to the king in council, from several merchants, tradesmen, freeholders and inhabitants of Helleston, in which two of the ten remaining corporators joined, stating the facts just mentioned and alledging that the corporation was totally dissolved; praying therefore such relief as should be thought fit. After various hearings, a new charter was granted to the borough on the

the 3d of September, 1774, similar to the former, with only the alteration, "that the freemen, who, notwithstanding the charter, had by the usage, been excluded from a share in the election of new freemen, should be expressly excluded by the new charter—and that by the new charter a mayor, four aldermen, and thirty-one freemen, including the mayor and aldermen, were appointed *nominatim* by this charter. Richard Johns was made an alderman, and the other seven remaining corporators (one of them having died in the interim) of the old body, were appointed among the new freemen. The charter was, on the 8th of September, delivered to the new mayor, who accepted it, and on the 9th issued notices, severally, to all the new corporators, requiring them to meet on the 12th, in order to accept the charter and the offices to which they were thereby named. All but six of the old corporators accepted the charter and their offices, and took the oaths. Each of these six severally read a protest against the charter, and refused to accept or act under it. On Sunday the 25th of September, the new corporation met for the choice of a mayor, and John Rogers, Esq. was elected. The six protesting freemen did not attend at this election.

The precept for the election of members of parliament was sent by the sheriff to Mr. Rogers, who gave notice that the election would be on the 11th of October. On the day of election, the precept being read by Mr. Rogers, all the new members of the corporation, but the six protestors, voted for the two sitting members. The six, after protesting against the legality of Rogers acting as presiding officer, gave their votes at *his* poll for Mr. Yorke and Mr. Cust. They afterwards proceeded by themselves to make an election of those two gentlemen. Richard Johns *there* acted as presiding officer, and made a return, which was delivered to the sheriff. Rogers, also, made a return of the sitting members, which he annexed to the precept, and delivered to the sheriff. Johns return was first received, but the sheriff having taken the advice of counsel, annexed the return of Rogers to the writ, and sent it by his agent to the clerk of the crown. He also sent the other return by his agent, but not annexed to the writ. The clerk of the crown said, he could not receive the last, as it was not to the writ. It was accordingly rejected, and sent back to Cornwall,

Cornwall, but was produced by the under sheriff on the trial before the committee.

Under all the circumstances of this case, the counsel for the petitioners contended, 1. That the new charter was void and that the only persons who had a right to elect members of parliament for Helleston, were the subsisting freemen under the old charter. 2. That if the charter was valid, still the freemen appointed by it, not having been in possession of the franchise a year before the election, they were by the statute of the 3d. of the present king, cap. 15. incapable of voting at the last election; and therefore the only competent electors, at that time, were the subsisting members of the corporation. They argued, that if the old body existed as a corporation when the charter passed, and when it was tendered, acceptance by the majority of the old corporators was necessary to make it valid, and as they, after opposing it at all its stages, rejected it when offered for acceptance, it became by such refusal void to all intents and purposes. Acceptance is necessary to give validity to a new charter. This is an established and uncontrovertible principle of law. There were only three ways by which a corporation can cease to exist.

One forfeiture by *abuses*, or *non-uses*. 2d. Voluntary surrender. 3d. The death of all the *natural* persons members of the corporate body.

Forfeiture cannot dissolve a corporation, but by judgment of ouster against the whole. Surrender can only be by acceptance on record. But there was no pretence of surrender in this case. And there was no question, but that eight of the natural persons, members of the aggregate body, were still alive. They adduced the cases of Bewdley, Plympton, Durham, and Colchester, to prove that though some of the integral parts of the corporation were gone, yet still, as they remained several members of it, they could exercise several franchises as corporators—they could enjoy any right of common belonging to the corporation—they could accept or refuse a charter, and they could vote for members of parliament. If they could do these acts, no new charter could transfer their right from them to another corporation. But if this doctrine were not so clear, still the new corporation could not vote at the last election, having been made freemen within the year, agreeable to the statute of George III.

The counsel for the sitting members said, that when the new charter passed, the old corporation was totally dissolved. The six who refused the charter could not be considered as acting in a corporate capacity, but merely as individuals, and therefore their refusal did not affect the validity of the charter, and the votes of the members of the new corporation were not affected by the statute of 3 George, 1777. Every corporation aggregate consists of certain integral parts, chalked out by the hand which formed it. If it ceases to have the form given it, if any of its vital parts are lost, it no longer exists in that state in which it was endowed with its powers; it is no longer that thing on which those powers were confined, and therefore it ceases to exist. They quoted many cases to prove, that the dissolution of an integral part produced the dissolution of the corporation, and several law authorities in support of the doctrine. And that the statute of George the Third did not affect the votes of the new members, was clear from the words of that statute. The disqualification created by it, regards persons *admitted* to this freedom within the year. A man cannot be said to be admitted into what does not exist. Till those men were *made* freemen by the new charter, the corporation had no existence.

The committee determined, that Philip Yorke, Esq. and Francis Cust, Esq. the petitioners, were duly elected, and ought to have been returned. An order was accordingly made by the house for taking off the indenture of return annexed to the writ for the county of Cornwall, and annexing thereto the indenture of return expected by Richard Johns and others.

Case of the Borough of IVELCHESTER.—Petitioners, Richard Brown, Esq. and Inigo William Jones, Esq. James Curry and John Cox, on behalf of themselves and others, being inhabitants, leaseholders, parishioners, and voters within the borough of IVELCHESTER.—Sitting members, Peregrine Cust, Esq. William Innes, Esq.

The allegation in this case was principally confined to a charge of bribery; and several witnesses were called to prove that the sitting members had, by their agents, notoriously bribed and corrupted the electors; evidence was not produced, however, to destroy the majority which the sitting members had

had over the petitioners; the bribery disqualified a part, but not all of the majority; so that the committee could not declare the petitioners to be duly elected. Their decision was that none of the four candidates were duly elected, and that it was a void election.

Second case of the Borough of IVELCHESTER.—Petitioners, *Richard Brown, Esq. and Inigo William Jones, Esq.*—Sitting members, *Nathaniel Webb, Esq. Owen Salisbury Brereton.*

After the petition was presented, the parties compromised the matter; a committee being therefore formed, the parties were called in, and the counsel for the petitioners informing them that they had no evidence to impeach the seats of the sitting members, they were immediately declared to be duly elected.

Case of the Borough of ST. IVES.—Petitioners, *Samuel Stephens, Esq. several inhabitants, electors of ST. IVES*—*William Praed, Esq. Adam Drummond, Esq.*

The petitions set forth that the sitting members were guilty of bribery; and that the returning officer had acted partially by admitting persons to vote, who had no vote, and rejecting others who had a right. The last determination of the right of election was on the 8th of December, 1702.—The petitioners proved that Mr. Praed, the father of the sitting member, had advanced sums of money to the voters, for which he took their votes; that when the voters received the money, there was a condition annexed that they should vote for his son and a friend; and that they were given to understand, if they complied with this condition, the money would never be demanded of them. Mr. Praed and Mr. Drummond canvassed together; they likewise proposed to add about forty to the poll in favour of Mr. Stephens, by proving that though they had not been rated, and had not paid, they possessed rateable property, and ought to have been rated, and were therefore entitled to vote; but this the committee overruled, and resolved, “that persons, though possessed of rateable property, if they have not been rated, and cannot prove misconduct in the overseers in not rating them, are not entitled to vote.” Mr. Praed was excluded on account of the

bribery, and the committee determined that Mr. Drummond was duly elected, and that the election with respect to one of the burgessees was void; and accordingly a new writ was ordered.

Case of the Borough of MILBURN PORT.—Petitioners were, Edward Walter, Esq. and Isaac Hawkins Browne, Esq. the Hon. Temple Luttrell, and Charles Wolseley, Esq. certain inhabitants of the town and borough of MILBURN PORT.—(In the interest of Luttrell and Wolseley.)

There were three returns made by different persons claiming to be returning officers, all of which had been annexed to the writ by the sheriff, and returned into the office of the clerk of the crown. Walter and Browne were returned by one, and Luttrell and Wolseley by the other two. The constitution of the borough of Milburn Port is this: it consists of nine bailiwicks, of which part were the property of Thomas Hutchins Medlycot, Esq. and part of Mr. Walter. The two principal or reigning bailiffs appoint two sub-bailiffs for the year, who are the returning officers. In the year 1773, it happened that Mr. Medlycot had the appointment of one of the sub-bailiffs, and Mr. Walter of the other; Mr. Medlycot named one Elias Oliver, and Mr. Walter nominated one Robert Baunton. In 1774, it was Mr. Medlycot's turn to nominate both the sub-bailiffs. It appeared that the court-leet for appointing sub-bailiffs had always been holden, before and since the stile was altered, on the first Tuesday after Park Monday. On the 3d of October, 1774, the precept for the election was delivered to Robert Baunton, who gave his receipt for it, and having communicated with the other sub-bailiff, they concurred in appointing the day of election to be on the 10th.

On the 4th of October, (being the first Tuesday in October, N. S.) Oliver, with Medlycot and others, entered the town-hall, and nominated the capital reigning bailiffs for the year ensuing; who again appointed John Newton, junior, and John Peckham, to be their sub-bailiffs. At the same court, Oliver was appointed a constable, and sworn into that office.

On the 10th, the election came on, and there were three polls taken: one by Baunton, who declared the majority of legal votes to be in favour of Walter and Browne; one by Oliver, and a third by Newton and Peckham. By each of the two last, Luttrell and Wolseley had the majority of votes.

The question therefore was, whether Newton and Peckham were the legal sub-bailiffs at the time of the election? if they were so, their return only was valid: if they were not, the question would be, whether the return of Baunton, or of Oliver, was the legal return, or whether they were both void?

The evidence and the arguments of the counsel served to shew, that the court-leet holden on the 4th of October, at which Newton and Peckham were appointed, was holden a fortnight before the usual time; it has been ever until that year kept agreeable to the old stile, and not to the new; the first Tuesday of October, new stile, was on the 4th, and the first Tuesday, old stile, was on the 18th of the month, new stile; the court-leet was consequently holden a fortnight sooner than it would have been, if there had been no change of the stile, and consequently not according to the provision of the statute. The committee resolved; "that the return made by John Newton, junior, and John Peckham, of Mr. Luttrell and Mr. Wolseley, was an illegal return."

"And that the other two returns appeared to the committee to be complicated together, that they thought it their duty to go upon the merits of the election, without previously deciding between them."

The parties claimed respectively the majority of legal votes, by objecting to several of these on the poll of their opponents, and it was contended by Walter and Browne, that the last determination of the house on the right of election, was on the 8th December, 1702. On the other side it was contended, that there were only two commonalty stewards, the other seven being denominated the *assistants* or *the bonage*; and proofs were adduced by both parties in support of their allegations.

There was also a mutual charge exhibited of having the votes of inhabitants fraudulently rated; it appeared that there had been great struggles between Mr. Medlycot and Mr. Walter, about the appointment of overseers of the poor. The committee therefore proposed that the following question should be argued by the counsel, viz.

"Whether persons *rateable*, and having *paid* to the rate, though that rate were made and collected by officers illegal, or doubtful, may vote as inhabitants paying *scot and lot*?"

and

And after hearing the arguments on both sides, they decided the question by another resolution in the affirmative.

This point of law being decided, the discussion of each particular vote turned merely on the matter of fact; one person in particular was objected to as under a conviction of felony; but this was contended on the other part to be no ground of disfranchisement.

An attempt was also made to prove that Mr. Luttrell was ineligible, because he held the office, by deputation, of *customs inwards in the port of Bristol*. No substantial proof of this fact was adduced.

After several days consideration, the committee determined on the petitions, by which they declared the honourable Temple Luttrell, and Charles Wolseley, Esq. to be duly returned, and elected burgesses to serve in parliament for the said borough; and that Edward Walter, Esq. and Isaac Hawkins Browne, Esq. were not duly elected.

Case of the Borough of MORPETH.—Petitioners, Hon. William Byron, certain freemen and electors of the borough of Morpeth, against Francis Eyre, Esq. sitting member.

The petitions set forth, that at the election, when Peter Delmé, Esq. Francis Eyre, Esq. Thomas Charles Bigge, Esq. and the Hon William Byron, were candidates for the borough of Morpeth, Mr. Delmé and Mr. Byron had the majority of votes at the conclusion of the poll, in the judgment of the two bailiffs who presided, and who were the proper returning officers, but that they were afterwards compelled by the violence and threats of a violent and outrageous mob, to sign a return of Mr. Eyre instead of the petitioner.

After receiving the proof of this allegation, the committee decided, "That Francis Eyre, Esq. was not duly elected, and that the Hon. William Byron ought to have been returned a burgess to serve in Parliament for the said borough."

An order was made at the same time, "That Francis Eyre, Esq. and the freemen and electors of the borough of Morpeth be at liberty to petition the house, to question the election of the Hon William Byron within fourteen days, if they thought fit."

A petition was accordingly presented by Mr. Eyre, charging Mr. Byron and Mr. Delmé directly with bribery by themselves and agents.

Case of the City of PETERBOROUGH.—Petitioner, James Phipps, Esq.—Sitting Member, Matthew Wyldbore, Esq.

The petition contained a charge of bribery against the sitting member, and alledged that legal votes tendered for the petitioner had been rejected, and the suffrages of persons not entitled to vote received for the sitting member. The last determination of the house was on the 13th of May, 1728. The point of bribery was abandoned.

The counsel for Mr. Phipps produced evidence to shew, that a most partial rate had been made in the year 1774, for the purpose of garbling the election; and then they contended, that five persons should be struck from the poll, being fraudulently rated for property of which they were not the occupiers. 2. That two should be struck off, because they were not bona fide householders within the precincts of the minister—and thirdly, they contended, that certain persons, who had voted as inhabitants of the city, without the precincts of the minister, were not householders, and consequently not entitled to vote by the last determination. On this point the counsel for the sitting member objected to the hearing of evidence. The counsel for the petitioner contended, that the description of an inhabitant paying scot and lot necessarily implies, that the person so described should be a householder. After hearing the arguments on both sides the committee resolved, “that the word “householders” in the resolution of the House of Commons, of the 13th of May, 1728, relates to the inhabitants within the precinct of the minister only, and not to other the inhabitants within the said city, paying scot and lot.” The counsel for the petitioner then proceeded to shew that there had been great misconduct and partiality observed in not rating a Thomas Felton. He had been rated immediately before, and was left out of the rate of September, 1774. After hearing arguments, the committee decided, “that the parties should not go into evidence to prove that Thomas Felton ought to have been admitted upon the rate in September, 1774.” But at the same time they resolved, “that the council for the petitioner be permitted to proceed to offer any evidence they think proper to prove any misconduct relative to that rate. But afterwards when they heard the species of evidence, that was to be adduced to prove the misconduct, they resolved, “that the committee

committee were of opinion, that the evidence which the counsel for the petitioner proposed to offer, is inconsistent with the resolution which the committee have already come to." On this, the counsel for the petitioner said, he would give the committee no farther trouble, and the sitting member was declared to be duly elected.

Case of the Borough of PONTEFRAC T.—Petitioners, the Hon. Charles James Fox, and James Hare, Esq. several inhabitants, householders, and electors of the Borough of Pontefract.—Sitting Members, Sir John Goodricke, Bart. and Charles Mellish, Esq.

The only question in the case was, concerning the right of election in the borough,—Whether a resolution of 1624, or one of 1770, was to be considered as the last determination in the House of Commons, within the meaning of the statute of George the Second. If the first was that determination, Mr. Fox and Mr. Hare had an unquestionable majority, and were duly elected; and vice versa.

There are two journals of the year 1624. In the first, intitled, "Originals of the Session of Parliament, holden at Westminster, 19^o Februarii, 21^o Jacobii, there is the following entry: 28th May, 1624. Mr. Glanvyle reporteth, for Pomfrett, two points. 1. Who, the electors?—Resolved by the committee, there being no charter, nor prescription for choice, the election is to be made by the inhabitants, householders, residents. Resolved also, so now, when the question—2. That the committee also of opinion, in respect the poll demanded, though interrupted by Beamart, yet the poll not being pursued, the choice of Sir Jo. Jackson, void, and a new warrant to issue for a new choice."

In the other, intitled "Prima sessio parliamenti inchoat. apud Westm. decimonono die Februarii, anno regni regis Jacobi, anglia, &c. vicesimo primo, et Scotia, quinquagesimo septimo,"—there is the following account of the same report: 28th May, 1624, Mr. Glanvill reports from the committee of privileges:

Concerning Pomfret. Question of Sir John Jackson.—Committee resolved, all the inhabitants, householders, ought to have voice. 2. Committee resolved, upon the latter writ, no burgesses chosen, but a new writ to go. "Resolved, that

the election ought to be in Pomfret, by the inhabitants, householders, residents there.

The resolution of 1770, is as follows: 6th February, 1770, Resolved, "that the right of election for members to serve in parliament for the borough of Pontefract, in the county of York, is in persons having within the said borough a freehold of burgage tenure, paying a burgage rent."

The counsel for the petitioners argued, that if the resolution of 1624 was the last determination of the house, in 1729, when the statute of George the Second passed, no subsequent act of the house can annul it; for that statute is binding on the house, and every last determination is to be considered as incorporated with, and making part of it. And they shewed, by various quotations from the Journals, that between 1624 and 1729, there was no resolution nor determination of the house on the right. The counsel for the sitting members argued, that the resolution of 1770 was conclusive. For though the *last determination* is binding on the house, yet, where a doubt arises, whether it is the last determination, the house is the only court competent to try that question. In 1770, the house did decide that what appears on the Journals of 1624, is not a last determination within the meaning of the act of George the Second, for they refused to let it be read as such, upon a division of 161 to 32. And they shewed by various references and descriptions, that the rule appointed by the resolution of 1770 had principally obtained in all the elections since 1624.

The committee therefore confirmed the due election of the two sitting members.

Case of the Borough and County of the town of POOLE.—Petitioners, Hon. Charles James Fox and John Williams, Esq. several inhabitants and householders (and also paying scot and bearing lot) within the borough and county of the town of Poole. Sitting members, Sir Eyre Coote, K. B. Joshua Mauger, Esq.

The only question in the case was, "Whether the right of election is in the burgesses of the borough exclusively, or, in the inhabitants and householders within the borough, paying scot and bearing lot?" The sheriff had rejected those who tendered their votes as inhabitants, householders,

holders, and only admitted the votes of burgesses. It was admitted that the sitting members had a majority of the letter; that if the former have a right to vote, there was a great majority in favour of the petitioners.

When the Chairman desired the clerk, as usual, to read the last determination of the house on the right of election, the counsel for the petitioners denied that there was any resolution in the Journals touching the right of election in this borough, which can be considered as a determination within the meaning of the statute. The counsel for the sitting members said, that such a determination was to be found on the Journals of the 9th of February, 1688-9. This entry was that "on a petition of Thomas Chaffer, Esq. complaining that Sir Nathaniel Napper had been returned in prejudice to him, the committee reported to the House, that the matter in question was, whether the right of election be in the mayor and burgesses only, or in the mayor, burgesses, and commonalty, who pay scot and lot? That it appeared to the committee by many parliament returns, which were produced to the committee, that the right of election had anciently been in the mayor and burgesses only, except a return in the 18th year of King James the First, wherein the *commonalty* are mentioned, with the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses, in the indenture; but that indenture is sealed with the *common seal* of the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses. That Sir Nathaniel Napper had 33 burgesses, and Mr. Chaffer but 22; but of the commonalty, that Mr. Chaffer was allowed to have had the greater number; and that thereupon the committee had agreed on two resolves. 1. That it is the opinion of this committee, that the right of election of burgesses to serve in this present convention for the town and county of Poole, is in the mayor, burgesses, and commonalty of the said town and county, who pay scot and lot. And 2. That Thomas Chaffer, Esq. is duly elected." A debate arose in the house on these resolutions, and they *disagreed* with the committee. It was urged on the one side, that this could not be a determination within the meaning of the statute; and after hearing the arguments on both sides, the committee ordered the counsel to proceed, and give evidence of the right of election. The counsel for the petitioners endeavoured to prove, that the right extended to the inhabitants, from
general

general principles of law, and from the history, constitution, and ancient usage of the borough. The counsel for the sitting members brought evidence also to prove, that it had been almost the invariable usage of the borough to confine the right of election to the burgesses.

The Committee agreed to this, and declared the sitting members to be duly elected.

Case of the Borough of PETERSFIELD.—Petitioner, the Hon. John Luttrell.—Sitting members, Sir Abraham Hume, Bart. William Joliffe, Esq.

The petition set forth, that Sir Abraham Hume, Bart. high sheriff for the county of Hertford, and Mr. Joliffe, by themselves and their agents, were guilty of notorious bribery and corruption; that the returning officer acted partially and unfairly in rejecting good and legal votes for the petitioner, and admitting bad ones for the sitting members. The last determination was on the 9th May, 1727.

The counsel for the petitioner argued on the first point, that Sir Abraham Hume, being high sheriff of the county of Hertford at the time of the election, was ineligible, and that notice thereof having been given to the returning officer, and the electors, the votes were thrown away; the counsel for the sitting members argued, that the committee could not go into this point, because there was no *express* allegation or complaint on that subject, in the petition; they said that the words "high sheriff of the county of Hertford," appeared in the petition merely as an addition or descriptio personæ. The committee resolved, that the counsel be "not permitted to argue the point of ineligibility of Sir Abraham Hume, as high sheriff of the county of Hertford, the same ineligibility not being an allegation in the petition." They then proceeded to call witnesses to prove the charge of bribery, but being prevented from asking questions that tended to prove the declaration of voters not on oath, the petitioners dropt the cause, and the sitting members were declared duly elected.

Case of the Town and Port of SEAFORD.—Petitioners, Stephen Sayre, Esq. and John Chetwood, Esq.—Sitting members, William Hall, Lord Viscount Gage; George Medley, Esq.

The

The petition set forth that many persons duly qualified, tendered their votes for the petitioners, but were rejected; by which means there was procured a majority for the sitting members. The last determination was 10th February, 1670-1, "that the committee were of opinion, that the bailiff, jurors, and freemen, had not only voices in election, but that the election was in the populacy. There is also an explanatory resolution on the 15th December, 1761; resolved, "that the word "populacy" (mentioned in the above determination) extended only to the inhabitants, housekeepers of the said town and port, paying scot and lot."

The counsel for the petitioners argued, that the explanatory resolution of 1761, was inconsistent with the true sense of the determination of 1670, which was the last determination of the House when the statute of 2 Geo. II. cap. 24. took place, and therefore final to all intents and purposes. The counsel for the sitting members objected to this being evidence to contradict the explanatory resolution, and after hearing arguments on both sides, the committee by a special resolution prevented them from producing evidence to call in question the said explanatory resolution. The counsel for the petitioners then proceeded to shew, that it is not necessary that persons, in order to answer the description of scot and lot-men, should actually be rated to, and pay the poor tax; 47 persons, who tendered their votes at the poll for the petitioners were rejected, because their names did not appear on the last poor rate; these would have given the petitioners a majority. A great deal of evidence was brought to prove that these people were rateable, and that they had been kept off the books, merely for the purpose of the election. On the other hand it was argued, that if there was any irregularity or injustice in the rating of the inhabitants, they ought to have had recourse to the legal means of redress.

The committee determined that the two sitting members were duly elected.

Case of the Town and County of the Town of SOUTHAMPTON.--Petitioners, certain inhabitants of the town Southampton, in the interest of Lord Charles Montagu.--Sitting member John Fleming, Esq.

The petition stated, that tho' the town of Southampton

is governed by a mayor, and other officers, and has a sheriff of its own, and the sheriff of Hampshire has no officer to execute within the said town, yet persons having freeholds within the said town, vote in right of such freeholds, for knights of the shire, or county at large; and several other circumstances serve to shew, that the said town is still a part of the county at large; that Mr. Fleming was high sheriff of Hampshire when he was returned as a Burgess for Southampton; and therefore they prayed that the committee would permit Lord Charles Montagu to take his seat instead of Mr. Fleming.

The last determination of the house on the right of election in Southampton, was on the 17th of March, 1695/6.—The sole question in this case, was the circumstance of Mr. Fleming's being high sheriff. The counsel therefor argued from the words in the writ; from the precedents of the journals, and the history of parliament; and after hearing the arguments on both sides, the committee resolved "That it is the opinion of this committee, that John Fleming, Esq. being sheriff for Hampshire at the time of the last general election, was eligible to serve in parliament for the town of Southampton."—After this question was determined, the counsel for the petitioners said, they would prove that the sheriff of the town in making out his precept to the returning officer, had omitted the "Nomen."

The committee would not permit them to go into this point, as it was not alledged in the petition. The sitting member was therefore confirmed in his seat.

Case of the Town of SHREWSBURY.—Petitioners, William Pulteney, Esq. certain burgesses and others, electors of the town of Shrewsbury.—Sitting member, Charleton Leighton, Esq.

The petitioners set forth, that at the last election Robert Lord Clive, in the kingdom of Ireland, Charleton Leighton, Esq. and the petitioner, were candidates; and that the mayor by admitting votes for the two former, which ought to have been rejected, and rejecting others for the petitioner which ought to have been admitted, had stated a majority on the poll in favour of Lord Clive and Mr. Leighton, and had returned them, although the petitioner would have had

a great

a great majority of legal votes, if justice had been done time.—After the petition was presented, Lord Clive's death happened, but a new writ could not issue while the petition was depending.—Mr. Pulteney's petition was withdrawn, and a new writ was issued.—The only petition therefore which remained, was that of the burgesses and electors, who only complained of Mr. Leighton's election.

The last determination of the house on the right of election in Shrewsbury, was on the 9th of April, 1723.

If a class of men who had tendered their suffrages, and had been rejected by the returning officer, were intitled by law to vote, it was admitted that Mr. Pulteney had a majority, and was duly elected.

The counsel for the petitioners contended, that the persons whose votes had been rejected, were intitled to their freedom under two immemorial customs. 1. That all persons of the age of one and twenty, and who have served a seven years apprenticeship to one of the trades which form fourteen ancient companies by prescription or incorporation, have a right to demand and be admitted to their freedom, on paying five pounds and the usual fees.

2. That all persons born within the borough, are, at the age of one and twenty, intitled in like manner to demand and be admitted to their freedom on the same terms. The fact, that the rejected voters came under these descriptions, was admitted—and it was proved, that they had demanded this freedom a year before the election—and that they had tendered their votes at the election—but the two customs were called in question—By a decision of the Court of King's Bench, one Baxter had sued out a peremptory mandamus, and was admitted to his freedom—but the corporation after that decision, still refused to admit the persons who claimed under the customs.

The committee decided, that William Pulteney, Esq. was duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

Case of the Borough of SUDBURY.—Petitioners, Sir Walden Hanmer, Bart. on behalf of himself and Sir Patrick Blake, Bart. (absent in the island of St. Christopher's) certain electors for the borough of Sudbury.—Sitting members Thomas Fonnereau, Esq. Philip Champion Crespigny.

The petition set forth, that a great many legal voters, who

stance of persons admitted to their freedom without a title acquired either by birth, servitude, or redemption, but in 1772, the governing part of the corporation being in the interest of Mr. Fonnereau, made an entry in their books, importing that they had power to admit men claiming by any of the above titles, and also gratuitously or by *favour*, without any previous title or consideration in money. And the day after they admitted 170, of whom 130 had no right either by birth, servitude or redemption. On the second point, they said it had been the constant usage to permit persons having a title by birth to exercise all the rights of freemen *without any enrollment upon stamps*, and even without an entry of their admission in the books of the corporation. At the election 388 had been rejected, and it appeared that of this number 26 voted in 1734: 83 in 1747: 137 in May 1754: 187 in 1761 and 281 in 1768. The corporation had rejected them contrary to the usage. On the third point, it was said, that the lord mayor, just before the election, had a thousand copies printed of an extract from the Durham act 3 George III. cap. 15, containing the clause disqualifying freemen admitted to their freedom within the year, and mentioning the penalty of 100l. inflicted by the statute, if they shall presume to vote, *but remitting the exception in favour of persons who have an inchoate title.* He had himself caused these papers to be distributed among the persons claiming to be enrolled.—By this means an alarm was spread, and proof was adduced, that many legal voters were deterred from giving their votes for the petitioners on this account.

The counsel on both sides argued upon these points, and it was clearly by an admission of these facts, that the committee at last decided that Sir William Hammer, bart. and Sir Patrick Blake, bart. were duly elected and ought to have been returned.

In order to do this it was only necessary, from the statement of the case, and the evidence produced, to come to an opinion, “ that persons who derived their claims to their freedom from the antecedent title of birth, who had exercised all the rights of freemen, and that of voting for members of Parliament among the rest, for twenty years and upwards before the last election, who had demanded to be enrolled (and offered to prove that at their birth their fathers enjoyed and exercised the rights and franchises of freemen)

but were refused, had a right to vote, though they could not produce evidence of their admission upon stamps.

The committee severely reprimanded the mayor for his conduct.

Case of the Borough of TAUNTON.---Petitioners, Alexander Popham, Esq. and John Halliday, Esq. several inhabitants and electors of the Borough of Taunton.—Sitting Members, the Honourable Edward Stratford, Nathaniel Webb, Esq.

The petitions, set forth, that the mayor as returning officer, had by unnecessary adjournments protracted the poll from the 10th of October to the 18th, and that he had rejected many legal votes tendered for the petitioners, and admitted many illegal votes for the sitting members. That the petitioners were duly elected by a great majority of legal votes, and ought to have been returned. That the sitting members previous to, and during the election were guilty of bribery and corruption, by themselves and agents.

The last determination of the House on the right of election, in Taunton, was on the 28th of July 1715. In Taunton there is a clear distinction between *alms* and *charity*. *Alms* means parochial collection, or parish relief. *Charity* signifies sums arising from the revenue of certain specific funds which have been established or bequeathed for the purpose of assisting the poor. Neither alms nor charity disqualify an elector in Taunton, unless they have been received within a year before the election. It was agreed that a potwaller is a person who furnishes his own diet, whether he be a householder, or only a lodger; and it was agreed that to be a potwaller, he must have a residence, and legal parochial settlement in the borough. The counsel for the petitioners said that the Journals of the House have recognized that *apprentices* cannot be potwallers qualified to vote. The numbers on the poll, as produced by the returning officer, were as follows

For Webb,	—	260
Stratford,	—	254
Halliday,	—	202
Popham	—	201

The counsel for the petitioners proposed to disqualify

- 114 as having received the town charity,
- 2 as having received the churchwarden's charity,
- 3 as Chelsea pensioners,
- 19 as not having settlements in Taunton,

2 or 3 as certificate-men,
 2 as apprentices,
 2 as bribery agents.

And at the same time they said they would prove the charge of bribery. In the course of the cause it was settled that Chelsea pensioners might vote. It was agreed on both sides, that by the *lex loci* certificate-men cannot vote for this Borough. The counsel for the sitting members proposed to disqualify 31 of the petitioners votes on some clear grounds, and to recriminate the charge of bribery. After a very long investigation the committee determined that John Halliday, Esq. and Alexander Popham, Esq. were duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

The Case of the City and Liberty of WESTMINSTER.—
Petitioners, Henry Morres, Lord Viscount Mountmorres in the
Kingdom of Ireland, and several other Inhabitants, Electors
of the City and Liberty of Westminster.

The petition sets forth, that at the late Election the petitioners, Lord Mountmorres, Charles Stanhope, commonly called Lord Viscount Mahon, Hugh Percy, commonly called Earl Percy, Thomas Pelham Clinton, commonly called Lord Thomas Pelham Clinton, and Humphrey Cotes, esq, being candidates, the King's menial servants, not having proper houses of their own within the city of Westminster, gave voices in the said election, contrary to an express resolution of the House. "15th Nov. 1680, Resolved, that the King's menial servants not having proper houses of their own within the city of Westminster, have not right to give voices in the election of citizens to serve in Parliament for the said city." It also stated that divers peers and lords of parliament publickly canvassed and otherwise unduly interfered in the election, contrary to several express resolutions of the House; that during the election, after the teste and issuing out of the writ, Lord Percy and Lord Thomas Pelham Clinton by themselves or agents, were guilty of bribing, corrupting and entertaining the voters.

There is no general determination of the House, of the right of election in Westminster; but it seems to be agreed to be "In the inhabitants, householders, paying scot and lot.

The numbers on the poll stood thus :

For Earl Percy	4994
Lord Thomas Pelham Clinton	4744
Lord Mountmorres	2531
Lord Mahon	2342
Humphrey Cotes, esq.	130

It was proved that about nineteen persons under the description of the resolution of 1680, had polled for the sitting members. They were inhabitants of the Mews, and their Houses had of late, for the first time, been rated to the parish; on which account they claimed to be electors; but they acknowledged that their rates were paid by the King.—They had all been solicited for their votes by Lord Mountmorres and Lord Mahon. There was no positive proof of any direct solicitation of any peers, though there was strong presumptive proof: nor was there any evidence of bribery that came home to the sitting members.

The committee therefore declared Earl Percy and Lord Thomas Pelham Clinton to be duly elected.

Case for the City of WORCESTER.—Petitioner, Sir Watkin Lewes, Knight.—Sitting Members, John Walsh, esq. Thomas Bates Reus, esq.

The objects of the petitioner were I. To prove that bribery had been committed by the sitting members or their agents, and thereby to make the election void, as to them. II. To disqualify such a number of voters for the sitting members, and to add such a number to the poll for the petitioner, as to leave a majority in his favour, and entitle him to be declared duly elected. III. To induce the committee to make a special report to the House of the various matters particularly alledged in the petition against the sitting members, the corporation, the returning officer, a peer whose influence and interference was complained of, and the corrupted voters. On the first head witnesses were called, who swore to positive acts of bribery and promises by Mr. Walsh himself and by his agents. In answer to this, evidence was called on the other side, who positively contradicted the facts alledged, and in some instances the persons who were said to have given or to have received bribes persisted in denying the acts of bribery when confronted with the witnesses on the other side.—On the second point the counsel for the petitioner stated that a great number, con-

stituting

stituting the majority of the voters had been procured by promises and by money—and in particular upwards of 300 constables were sworn in, and received money from the chamberlain the day before the election, who all voted for the sitting members, and many witnesses proved that offers were made to others to make them constables, if they would vote for the sitting members. To this it was answered, that the petitioner had given rise to apprehensions by his conduct, that the election would be riotous, and therefore the corporation had wisely increased the number of constables. 19 voters were given up by the sitting members, because their names were not to be found in the corporation books. On the third point there was nothing material insisted upon—The council for the sitting members objected to going into evidence on the improper interference of the peer, as the committee of privileges appointed annually, was the proper place for such a complaint.

The committee determined, that the two sitting members were duly elected.

Case of the Borough of CARDIGAN, and its contributory Boroughs.—Petitioners, Thomas Jobnes the younger, esq.—Several Burgesses of the Boroughs of Cardigan, Aberystwith, and Lampeter.—Sitting Member, Sir Robert Smyth, bart.

The petition stated that Thomas Colby, esq. the returning officer permitted a great number of persons to poll for Sir Robert Smyth, who had no legal right to vote, and rejected the votes of divers others duly qualified, who offered to poll for Mr. Jobnes, and was guilty of many other notorious acts of partiality and injustice. The last determination of the right of election was on the 7th of May, 1730.—Burgesses are admitted into these boroughs without any particular qualification, and as all burgesses, whether resident or not, have a right to vote, it has been usual, previous to an election, to admit great numbers. Above 4000 were admitted at Cardigan alone, between the beginning of the year 1774 and the last election. Their votes, however, were not good on account of their occasionality. It had been usual before 1765 to give to each burgess a docket of his admission, written on a slip of stamped parchment, and signed by the Mayor and Town Clerk.—Since 1765, in consequence of the change then introduced in the law on this subject, a stamped

book has been kept, in which the town clerk orders the names of the new burgesses.

At the election the mayor laid down a rule, "that he would admit every person to poll who would *say* he was a burgess of one of the four boroughs, and had polled at a former election." Mr. Johnes' managers objected to this, and insisted that none should be admitted to vote who did not produce entries of their admissions on stamps, if admitted since 1765, or stamped dockets if made free prior to that time. Notwithstanding this, however, all voters who came for Sir Robert Smyth, were admitted to vote without any investigation of their titles, but the admissions of all those who voted for Johnes were produced and inquired into. About 249 of Sir Robert's voters declared at the poll that they had no admissions to produce, and about 134 said they never had any admissions. In the course of the proceeding before the committee, it was agreed that the agents of both parties should examine the poll for Sir Robert Smyth, with the books of the corporation. In consequence of their joint examination, it was *agreed* that of the votes for the sitting members,

1. A certain number was not to be found at all in the books.
2. That the names of a certain number were in the books, but that the descriptions added to those names in the books, and on the poll were not the same.
3. That a certain number were only found in a list, written in a book called the council-book.
4. That the admissions of a certain number were entered on stamps *during* the poll.
5. That the admissions of others were entered on stamps *after* the poll.
6. And of others within a year before the election.
7. That the entries respecting a certain number in the corporation books, and on the poll, agreed both in the names and description.

The first class were given up by the counsel for the sitting member. On the second point the committee determined, "that the counsel for the petitioners should make their objections to each individual vote; and that when the description in the books should appear to differ from the description on the poll, it was incumbent on the counsel, for the sitting member to remove the objections, so as to reconcile the difference. On the third question, a deal of evidence

was produced, to prove that the list was vague and unauthentic. That it was made in 1741, before an election, for the purpose of serving the interest of a Mr. Lloyd, and that the names contained in it had not been shewn to be taken from presentments enrolled in the leet-books. The committee determined, "that the leet of 1741, as entered in the council-book, was not admissible as evidence! On the fourth question, the committee resolved, "that the voters whose admissions were stamped during the poll, prior to their voting, are to be admitted as legal voters at this election.—The parties were to understand, that this resolution goes merely to the legality of stamping the admissions during the poll, before the voters had polled, and not to any other right whatsoever." On the fifth point, the committee resolved, "that persons, whose admissions were stamped after their votes were given, were not to be allowed as legal voters at the last election." On the sixth question, the committee resolved, "that it is not necessary by the statute of 3 George III. for freemen, whose right, in every other respect, is complete a year before an election, to have their admissions entered on stamps twelve Kalendar months before, in order to qualify them to vote at such election." On the seventh question, the council for the petitioners contended, that as there were so many persons of the same name in Wales, and as Mr. Johnes's agents were not suffered to enquire into the identity of these voters during the poll, it was now the business of the counsel for the sitting member to prove their identity. The committee, however, determined, that the onus of disproving the identity of the persons lay upon the counsel for the petitioners." In consequence of these resolutions of the committee, lists were prepared by the agents on each side, of the number of voters which were thereby disqualified, and the counsel for Sir Robert Smyth admitted, that as the poll then stood, there was a majority of fifty-eight in favour of Mr. Johnes.

Upon this, Smyth's counsel endeavoured, by evidence, to shew, that there was the greatest reason to believe, that many who had voted for Johnes, were not the persons who had really been admitted, but that they were men who had falsely personated those who were entitled to vote. On this, the committee resolved, "that as the identity of Mr. Johnes's voters had been scrutinized at the poll, it was not in-

incumbent on his counsel to identify them before the committee.

The committee then determined, that Thomas Johnes, the younger, Esq. was duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

The Case of the Borough of NEW RADNOR, and its Contributory Boroughs in the County of RADNOR.—Petitioners, Edward Lewis, esq. several Burgesses of the Borough of NEW RADNOR, and its Contributory Boroughs.—Sitting member, John Lewis, Esq.

Both the petitions contained a general allegation, that Edward Lewis, Esq. the petitioner, had a great majority of legal votes and was duly elected.

The last determination of the House on the right of election was on the 12th of November, 1690.—The counsel for the petitioner insisted that by the word Burgesses, "Is meant all burgesses whether resident or non-resident; and that by the standing order of 1735, the counsel for the sitting member were not at liberty to go into any proof to the contrary. The counsel on the other side contended that by the standing order, the House could never intend to prohibit the explanation of ambiguous or equivocal words; they said they only meant to shew that the House must have understood in this instance, not "Burgesses at large," but "Burgesses inhabitants."—The committee were of opinion that they were not precluded by the standing order from receiving such explanation.---After having heard the arguments of the counsel, and read the various determinations of the House on the Welch boroughs, the committee resolved that out-burgesses as well as inhabitants, were intitled by the determination of the House to vote, and they therefore declared that Edward Lewis, Esq. the petitioner, was duly elected, and ought to have been returned.

Case of the County of CLACKMANNAN.—Petitioner James Francis Erskine, Esq.---Sitting member Ralph Abercrombie, jun. Esq.

The petition set forth that the sitting member was absolutely disqualified and ineligible; that the petitioner had a majority of legal votes; and that the return of the sitting member was brought about by various illegal and unwarrantable acts and proceedings.---The counsel for the petitioner argued, that the sitting member ought to have given in a particular of his estate to the clerk of the House, within

within 15 days after the petition was read, according to the standing order.—It was either proved or admitted that Mr. Abercrombie had stood on the freeholders roll of Clackmannanshire even since 1759; but the petitioner objected to him on account of an alteration of circumstances—four months had elapsed and no complaint had been made to the court of session. The counsel for the sitting member contended, that now all the qualification necessary to be produced by him was his name on the roll.—That the House since the 16th of George the Second, had no jurisdiction with regard to the right of freeholders to stand on the roll, because the complaint is directed to be made to the court of session.

The committee were of opinion that they were bound by the statute of George the second; that the enrollment of the sitting member under all the circumstances of the case, was a sufficient answer to the petitioner's demand of his qualification; and that no other evidence should be called on the head of his qualification.—After this the petitioner informed them that he would not give them any further trouble—They therefore determined that the sitting member was duly elected.

Case of the County of FIFE.—Petitioner, John Henderson, Esq.—Sitting Member, James Townshend Oswald, Esq.

The numbers for Mr. Oswald were 61, and for the petitioner 61.—The counsel for the petitioner proposed to object to two of the votes for the sitting member, and his counsel again to one of the petitioner's.—The votes objected to by the petitioner, were those of Hugh Dalrymple, and William Melvil, Esqrs. They contended that the estate of Mr. Dalrymple was a redeemable right, not within the exception of the statute of 12 Anne, and therefore deprived of the right of voting. Mr. Melvil, they contended that he had no right to vote, as he was denuded of the title upon which he stood upon the roll; his wife in whose right he stood, having disposed her estate to her son Captain Graham.—After hearing the arguments on both sides, the committee informed the counsel that they were of opinion, that Hugh Dalrymple, Esq. of Fordell, and William Melvil, Esq. of Griegsten, had a right to vote at the last election of member to serve in parliament for the county of Fife.

Upon which the sitting member was declared to be duly elected.

Case

Case of the County of LANERK.—Petitioner, Daniel Campbell, Esq.—Sitting Member, Andrew Stuart, Esq.

The petition set forth that Mr. Stuart at the time of the election was ineligible, and that the petitioner had the majority of legal votes, and was duly elected. The counsel for the petitioner stated, that Mr. Stuart at the time of the election, held the office of joint king's remembrancer, in the court of exchequer in Scotland; which they said was an office of profit under the crown, erected since the 25th of October, 1705. The counsel for Mr. Stuart denied that he held the office at the time of his election.—On this a copy of the king's commissioner, under the union seal, bearing date the 25th of January, 1771, granting the place to Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Warrander jointly, was read. The counsel for Mr. Stewart then called several gentlemen to prove that he had resigned the office previous to the election. He had given by the hands of the solicitor-general, his resignation to the secretary of the treasury, but nothing had been done in it.

The committee resolved, "That it is the opinion of the committee, that Andrew Stuart, Esq. by the instrument of resignation executed at Edinburgh, on the 18th of October, 1774, and delivered to Mr. Cooper on the 25th of the same month, was at the time of his election divested of the office of king's remembrancer in the court of exchequer, in Scotland." This resolution of course put an end to the cause, and the sitting member was declared duly elected.

Case of the District of NORTH BERWICK, HADDINGTON, LAUDER, JEDBURGH, and DUNBAR.—Petitioners, Sir Alexander Gilmour, Bart. Andrew Dickson, Esq. constituent Members of the Town Council of the Borough of Haddington, at Michaelmas, 1774; The Magistrates and Town Council of North Berwick; The Provost, Magistrates, and Council of the Borough of Dunbar.—Sitting Member, The Hon. John Maitland.

The petitions set forth that at the election at North Berwick, the presiding borough commissions were produced in favour of persons named as delegates for the several boroughs; and David Kinloch, Esq. appeared, and claimed a vote, as having been the person duly elected delegate for the borough of Haddington; though a commission had been made out in favour of Robert Burton, Esq. provost of Haddington, and accordingly he gave his vote at the election

under protest. That the delegates producing commissions from the boroughs Haddington, Lauder, and Jedburgh, voted for the Hon. John Maitland, clerk of the pipe in the court of exchequer, in Scotland; and the delegates from North Berwick and Dunbar, voted for Sir Alexander Gilmour. That Mr. Maitland was ineligible, on account of his office which had been created since the 25th of October, 1705.—That besides this, the two commissions for the boroughs of Haddington and Jedburgh, had been granted by persons who were by law incapable of electing a delegate, having no right themselves to the offices they assumed in the said borough; and that the said commissions were procured by bribery, &c. From this state of the allegations it appeared, that the two general questions in the case were 1. Whether Mr. Maitland was eligible? 2. Whether he, or Sir Alexander Gilmour had the majority of legal votes. After hearing the arguments of counsel on both sides, the committee determined on the first point, “That the Hon. John Maitland, was eligible to serve in parliament, notwithstanding his being in possession of the office of clerk of the pipe, in the exchequer of Scotland, at the time of his election.”

On the second point, the counsel for the petitioners argued, that the commissions from the boroughs of Haddington and Jedburgh were illegal, because the magistrates of these boroughs had not been duly chosen.—By the 9th section of the second of George II. cap. 24. it is enacted, “That the said statute shall be openly read at the annual election of magistrates and town-counsellors, for every borough within that part of Great Britain called Scotland.” This provision was not complied with at the last annual election of magistrates for these boroughs, and therefore the election was void, and consequently their future election of delegates. To this it was answered that this statute was merely directory, and that it never was read unless upon the request of a member of the counsel. This point was therefore dropped; but another objection was started against the magistracy of Jedburgh, because in their last election they had departed from the *sett*, in not purging the council till some days after the election; but they were not able to prove from the usage, that there was any illegal irregularity in the proceeding.

The Committee declared the sitting member to be duly elected.

Case of the District of WIGTOWN, WHITEHORN, NEW GALLOWAY, and STRANRAER.—Petitioner, Henry W. Dashwood, Esq.—Sitting Member, William Norton, Esq.

The petition stated that the delegates for the boroughs of Wigtown, Whitehorn, and Stranraer, met at New Galloway, the presiding borough, and that Alexander Ferguson Esq. chosen and appointed delegate for the borough of New Galloway, absented himself from the said election, having pretended to resign the office of delegate. That John Newall, Esq. pretending to have been duly chosen delegate for the said borough of New Galloway, upon such pretended resignation of the said Alexander Ferguson, was admitted to vote, and accordingly did vote for the the sitting Member.—But the petitioner having had the votes of Wigtown and Whitehorn, and Mr. Norton the legal vote of Stranraer only, had thereby a majority of legal votes, and ought to have been returned.

There were two questions in this case, 1. Whether Mr. Newall was duly chosen a delegate for the borough of New Galloway, and was capable of voting: and 2. Whether a person, not a burghers of any one of the boroughs composing a district, is capable of being elected a burghers to serve in parliament. Mr. Dashwood was not a burghers of either of the four boroughs, and this objection was taken to his eligibility by the counsel for the sitting member.

On the first point it was stated, that Mr. Ferguson was duly chosen the delegate of New Galloway, agreeable to the statute; but on the morning of the day of election, a letter was presented to the council of New Galloway, from Mr. Ferguson, in which he resigned his commission. The council immediately proceeded to the choice of another delegate and the same people chose Mr. Newall.—But the statute says that two days should intervene between the meeting for naming the day of election, and the day of election. They urged that Mr. Ferguson could not resign, nor the council chose another, he was *functum officio*. Upon the second point it was urged that there was not any positive and direct statute, which enjoined that the burghesses for the royal boroughs should be actual burghesses in the district. It was the usage indeed that they should be honorary, but honorary burghesses can act in no corporate capacity, and are merely nominal. The committee determined that Henry Watkin Dashwood, Esq. was duly elected.